DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 414 HE 009 862

AUTHOR	Whitlock, Baird W.
TITLE	Don't Hold Them Back. A Critique and Guide to New High School-College Articulation Models.
INSTITUTION	College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	179p.
AVAILABLE FROM	College Board Publication Orders, Box 2815, Princeton, New Jersey 08540 ($8.95)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Advanced Placement Programs; *Advanced Students; Age; *Articulation (Program); Bachelors Degrees; *College Admission; *College High School Cooperation; College Preparation; Curriculum Development; *Early Admission; Educational Change; Higher Education; *High School Students; Innovation
IDENTIFIERS	International Baccalaureate; *Simons Rock College MA

ABSTRACT

The issue of early admissions or high school-college articulation is examined. Following a historical analysis of early college, reasons for and drawbacks to such a change are discussed. The experience at Simon's Rock Early College between 1972 and 1976, when they instituted a four-year program beginning after tenth grade and ending with a B.A. degree, is described. The remainder of the book examines different methods of breaking the traditional articulation of high school and college including the Advanced Placement Program and the International Baccalaureate, high school-college programs, early admission, the middle college, and the early college. (SPG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED157414

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
CEEB
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Don't hold them back

by Baird W. Whitlock

HE 009 862

Don't hold them back

A Critique and Guide to New High School–College Articulation Models

Baird W. Whitlock
Former President, Simon's Rock Early College

College Entrance Examination Board
New York, 1978

The College Entrance Examination Board is a nonprofit membership organization that provides tests and other educational services for students, schools, and colleges. The membership is composed of more than 2,000 colleges, school systems, and education associations. Representatives of the members serve on the Board of Trustees and advisory councils and committees that consider the Board's programs and participate in the determination of its policies and activities.

Copies of this book may be ordered from College Board Publication Orders, Box 2815, Princeton, New Jersey 08540. The price is $8.95.
Editorial inquiries concerning this book should be directed to Editorial Office, College Entrance Examination Board, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, 10019.

Copyright © 1978 by College Entrance Examination Board. All rights reserved.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 78-50072.
Printed in the United States of America.

Publication of this book has been made possible by a grant from the Exxon Education Foundation

Contents

Introduction 1

Historical Background 4

Reasons for a Change 23

Drawbacks to Change 34

Simon's Rock Early College 44

Advanced Placement and the International Baccalaureate . . 64

High School–College Programs 96

Early Admission 110

The Middle College 137

The Early College 152

Degrees and Accreditation 161

Is It Worth It? 168

Current Methods for Shortening the Time to the Bachelor's Degree 173

Introduction

In the spring of 1972 I received a letter asking if I were interested in being considered for the presidency of Simon's Rock. I said I might be, but that I hadn't the faintest idea what Simon's Rock was. Thus my acquaintance with the early college concept began. I had taught younger-than-normal students since 1948 at Middlebury College where I had started teaching, but like so many other college faculty, I had paid little attention to the issue of early admissions or to high school-college articulation. As a matter of fact, the use of the word "articulation" to describe the meshing of high school and college programs was unknown to me until, as Chairman of the English Department at San Francisco State, I found myself attending "Articulation Meetings." Later, as Head of the English Department at the University of Wyoming, the word became even more meaningful to me. As the university was the only four-year college in the state, all the schools geared their programs toward it. Articulation became a clearly-defined process on which one could focus.

Still later, as Head of the Freshman Liberal Studies Program at Elmira College, I found myself dealing with the problems of early admission students, freshman advising programs, varying levels of college preparation, and all those elements of the education of late adolescents that were to become the core of the early college program. I was indeed interested in Simon's Rock.

But I was not interested in it the way it was: a middle college that took students from the end of tenth grade and gave them an A.A. degree four years later. It was so obvious that the students were already capable of college work that it was unfair to keep them in a junior college framework, and yet that was the situation, one that all the other candidates being seriously considered for the office of president apparently were willing to continue.

The Board of Trustees at Simon's Rock and most of the faculty were ready for the new venture, and the next four years were busy ones. The general results are described in this book: accreditation, B.A. degree-granting authority for a four-year program beginning after tenth grade, a full set of interdisciplinary majors, a strong evaluation and external examiner program, a clearly-defined transition year, a strong undergraduate faculty and library, an active Junior Year Abroad program, major grant support from Carnegie Corporation of New York and the National Science Foundation, and national and international publicity.

One result was that Simon's Rock became a focus of inquiry from

all parts of the country concerning early college and early admission programs. When, having achieved the goals I had set on arrival, I left the president's office in September of 1976, it seemed appropriate to bring together the information I had gathered during the previous four years in order to let others know the advances that had been made in various parts of the country and to offer some realistic advice about how to start new programs. There was as yet no way for an interested educator or parent to find out what was going on in the whole field of early college education. Even those deeply involved in some of the best innovative programs did not know of other activities of a similar nature. Each thought itself unique.

Grants from Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Ford Foundation not only made this study possible but in a sense altered the nature of the book itself. I found that although I had been in the center of much of what had been happening, I had only a slight idea of the degree of activity that existed. There are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of schools and colleges involved in some form of high school-college bridge program. Most of them are tenuous, and almost all suffer from a lack of knowledge of the various options open to them. Parents are often unaware of what the possibilities are for their children in their present schools, much less in other ones. There is little sharing of experience or information among schools. There almost seems to be a conspiracy of silence about the situation. We are on the verge of a real restructuring of American education that can finally free the individual student for his or her best progress between school and college. It is my hope that this volume will make a significant contribution to that restructuring.

There was one gap in my own background for approaching the field with understanding: I had never taught in a secondary school. All too often college faculty are not only willing but eager to tell high school teachers what is wrong with secondary education without having had any secondary school teaching experience. The grant from Carnegie Corporation provided an opportunity for me to spend a year teaching a course in Shakespeare at Phillips Academy in Andover, Massachusetts, talking with faculty members and with students, and taking part in the school's various activities. The experience has added not only to the validity of the judgments I have made here, but also to an understanding of the complexity of the problems of educating late adolescents.

This book was made possible by funds granted by Carnegie Cor-

poration of New York, the Ford Foundation, and the College Entrance Examination Board. The statements made and views expressed are solely the responsibility of the author. There are far too many people to whom the author is indebted to list them all. Students, teachers, and administrators at all the schools and colleges were uniformly helpful in their response to questions, as were members of state boards of education and higher education. If any names are to be singled out for thanks, they should be Theodore Sizer of Phillips Academy, Harlan Hanson of the College Board, and C. Alden Dunham of Carnegie Corporation for reading part or all of the manuscript and making helpful suggestions.

Those who made the research visits possible and fruitful include: Edward Carr, Livingston Smith, and Robert McHugh of the New York State Department of Education; Janet Lieberman of La Guardia Community College; Frs. William Le Roux and John Foster of Matteo Ricci College; Seth Spellman of SUNY-Albany; Frs. Stephen Gerencser and Bela Krigler of the Calasanctius School; Mark Gelber and Janet Palmer of Skidmore College; Katharine Robbins of Pasadena City College; Richard Suprina and E. R. Lukoski of Hauppauge High School; Charles Rose of International Baccalaureate; Harlan Hanson of the College Board; Joseph Fenn and Margaret Miller of the United Nations International School; Melvin Seritzky of Francis Lewis High School; David Harnett of Harvard University; Elizabeth Coleman of the New School; Richard Beeson and Ralph Conant of Shimer College, and Donald Harward of the University of Delaware.

Baird W. Whitlock

Andover, Massachusetts
November, 1977

Historical Background

There are few generalizations in education that are universally agreed upon, but one of them is that people learn at different rates. It seems strange, therefore, that education systems, supposedly dedicated to providing the best education for all students, are so structured that they block those differences. If the only reason were that the school structure is too unwieldy to provide for individual differentiation, there might be some excuse for the status quo; but instead the educational establishment usually cites "tradition" as the main reason for the "lockstep" of kindergarten, followed by twelve grades of school, followed by four years of college.

Any attempt to show that that rigidity is not necessary and that it should be broken down to permit more individualized movement must lay the argument of "tradition" to rest—permanently. That can be done fairly easily. One can begin almost anywhere. In 1977 it is perhaps fitting to remember that two hundred years ago at Phillips Academy in Andover, Massachusetts, Josiah Quincy of Boston, aged 6, was a classmate of James Anderson of Londonderry, New Hampshire, aged 30.

Earlier comparisons are perhaps even more helpful. The American educational system developed directly from England, and there the pattern was one of great diversity. In 1584 John Donne went up to Oxford at the age of either 11 or 12, taking his year younger brother with him. Among their classmates and college friends were Henry Fortescue, also 12, Henry King, 13, George Carew, 14, Richard Martin, 15, Henry Wotton, 16, Thomas Carew, 17, John Hoskyns, 19 (whose younger brother, with an identical family and Winchester College background, later entered Oxford at 17), Thomas Bastard, 20, and Hugh Holland, 24. Two decades later another pair of brothers who became part of this group of friends arrived at Oxford: George Herbert, aged 12 and Edward Herbert, aged 17.

At Oxford in the late 16th and early 17th centuries, therefore, there was no "right" chronological age to begin university, nor any set pattern of movement through preparatory years of study to gain admission.

So diverse were the possibilities in England in the 17th century that William Penn's friend, Bulstrode Whitelocke, entered his law studies at the Middle Temple at 13 and was called to the bar in the usual seven years, at age 20. Extreme youth sometimes brought with it special parental care, of course. Whitelocke was given permission to live in his father's lodgings, and George Herbert's mother moved to Oxford temporarily.

The pattern in early America was equally diverse. Cotton Mather graduated from Harvard at 16, as did Jonathan Edwards from Yale. John Trumbull left Master Tisdale's school in Lebanon, Connecticut, in 1768 to enter Harvard when he was 12, having completed a course of study that ranged from Greek and Latin to surveying and navigation. In the middle of the 19th century Henry Adams entered Harvard at 16 as an average student, if we are to believe his own estimate of his intellectual powers or his rank in class. The point is that youthful entrance to college was frequent, although not universal.

Flexibility based on individual abilities was the keynote. One of the first actions of the Board of Regents of New York, after its founding in 1784, "was to specify that students entering college did not necessarily have to start out as freshmen . . . and would be admitted 'into such classes in the said College as they shall be qualified to enter.' "[1]

Schools were equally various. The "grammar school" of the colonial period was often equal, in the training it provided, to colleges of the time. (The "petty school" was the early equivalent of our own primary school.) Although the grammar schools continued to exist after the Revolution, they were challenged by the rise of the academies between the Revolution and the Civil War.

The academy was an attempt to provide a middle road between the traditional education of the grammar school and a practical education, although the only real occupational training offered was for teachers. The academies' stated purpose was to provide an educated electorate for the young country; at least 6,000 of them—and probably more—were established before the Civil War. They differed from the local grammar schools in that they admitted students from other towns and states, were far more aware of the educational needs of young girls, and offered a more diversified curriculum. The range in quality of education provided by the academies was great. The best not only overlapped the colleges in coursework but rivalled them in quality; the worst were little more than common schools. By the 1830s the overlap with colleges was still so great that only the curriculum distinguished the two. As the post-Civil War population boom led to the rapid growth of the public high school, some academies became colleges, others became normal schools for teacher training, and a goodly number became exclusive preparatory schools. Some of the latter still overlap most college programs in twelfth grade coursework.

The growth of the cities led to the growth of public high schools, and the elementary curriculum expanded instead of becoming more diversified. In 1894, R. G. Huling, a high school principal, stated that the high school curriculum was "practically the systematic expansion through a four-years' secondary course of the modern studies mapped out for the elementary schools."[2] The basic curriculum was English, mathematics, modern foreign languages, history, basic science, and a good deal of Latin. The main question for anyone interested in the development of American education is why did such a chance structure become so hardened? Theodore Sizer, in his study *Secondary Schools at the Turn of the Century*, proposes one clear answer. The high school became the sorting mechanism for the employment market place. But it was not what was learned that was important: "The diploma, more than the substance of the student's formal education, acquired important symbolic value on the labor market."[3] And this had a stultifying effect on curricular change: "As long as education is a symbol rather than a substance, a premium is placed on its changelessness."[4]

However, the diploma meant various things in various places. For example, by 1891 Tennessee was defining secondary education as grades six through eight. State boards of education were the real determining factors of secondary programs as they had the power to provide or withhold funds to the local school systems.

In the articulation of the secondary schools and the colleges, the state boards had to share their power with the admissions programs of the colleges, especially the prestigious eastern colleges. As these colleges selected their students through entrance examinations, schools that wished to send their students to such colleges had to gear their programs to the requirements of those exams. While this placed a burden on the schools, the individual student still had the opportunity to move at his own pace more easily, since he could take the examinations when he and his teachers considered him ready. As the difference in individual college exams presented a great problem for the schools, both private and public, individual states as well as individual colleges soon resorted to accrediting schools rather than individual students. The University of Michigan, for example, introduced the system in 1871. (By 1896, 192 colleges were involved in the practice.) The next logical step was regional accreditation. New England began the process in 1885, followed by Middle States in 1892, and by the North Central and Southern associations in 1895.

Individual colleges continued to maintain their own requirements, however, and many of them solved the problem of widely different levels of preparation in their feeder schools by establishing their own preparatory departments to bring students from elementary to college levels of performance.

If there was a difference in the secondary schools, there was an equally wide difference in the colleges: from Harvard and Yale to Sinclair Lewis's not-so-fictional Terwillinger College, "one of ten denominational colleges, all of them with buildings and presidents and chapel services and yells and colors and a standard of scholarship equal to the best high-schools."[5] The situation has changed little through the years, except perhaps to become worse. One eastern junior college has entering classes whose average reading ability is at the fourth grade level.

One result of the changing situation was a later entry into college. In 1894 the average age of the Harvard freshmen was almost nineteen. All high school students were by that time almost uniformly in their teens.

The country-wide awareness of the complexity of the problems of high school education led, in 1893, to the famous report of the Committee of 10, chaired by Harvard President Charles Eliot. The membership of the committee, made up of college presidents and school administrators, shows how the age shift had worked. They had entered college late, several at 19 or 20. President Eliot, on the other hand, had graduated from Harvard at 19. One group reporting to the committee, the Greek Conference, actually saw the dangers of the changing age situation. They recommended, "That in making the following recommendations, this Conference desires that the average age at which pupils now enter should be lowered rather than raised."[6]

President Eliot had stated his personal position on the educational structure five years earlier, in 1888: "All our divisions of the total school period into years, primary, grammar, and high schools, are artificial, and in most cases hurtful or hindering to the individual. The whole school life should be one unbroken flow from one fresh interest and one new delight to another, and the rate of that flow ought to be different for each individual child."[7] Unfortunately, Eliot did not press his own convictions on the committee he chaired.

From the start the committee, set up by the National Council of Education, bypassed any philosophical questions about the nature of the learning process or the needs of the individual learner. They

assumed that schooling should start at 6 and end at 18. "The questions they asked were mechanical—how long, when, how—never what and why. . . . There was no indication that the Committee sensed that the NCE had overlooked any of the crucial factors affecting secondary education in America or that the Committee was going to take a broad, fresh look at the institutions it was charged to improve. Led by a practical administrator, the Ten stayed close to concrete curricular problems."[8]

The effect of the committee's report was immediate and widespread. "It may safely be said that there is not a high school in the United States today that is not affected by the Report of this great committee; its total influence is beyond estimate."[9] As Dr. Sizer has concluded, "it influenced school programs and courses, and (a less tangible effect) it exerted a broad general influence on school policy and the thinking of educators. This second kind of influence was the more important of the two."[10] The hardening of the arteries of American secondary education had begun to set in.

Why should a single event of this kind become a "tradition" so quickly? The symbolic nature of the diploma is certainly one answer, but I would suggest another. For reasons that are not totally clear, Americans seem to possess very short political memories. Recent political events tend to support this generalization. Surely one purpose of the "stonewalling" by the Nixon administration over Watergate was to let time pass so that people would forget the whole thing. As a country we are even urged to forget unpleasant events such as Vietnam. If, as I believe, we are aware of this forgetfulness, we substitute traditions as group memories in order to forget past problems and hang on to what we want to believe to be long held beliefs or actions. New colleges and schools often set up committees to "establish traditions," almost a contradiction in terms.

Certainly the problems of the diversity of school systems that arose in the 19th century was something that educators wanted to forget, just as educators would like to believe today that there is some consistency in the preparation of students in the multiplicity of schools and colleges that frequent the land. Implied in regional accreditation is the idea that an accredited institution, be it a high school or college, is providing an education much like that of other schools or colleges, even though everyone knows that such a belief is palpably untrue. But the Committee of 10 provided a curricular structure that looked as if it could be applied consistently, although

the committee itself was frighteningly aware of the disparity in teacher education and the quality of students in different schools. In a sense, the committee created a "traditional structure" that allowed society to believe that the results would conform to the new tradition, and it desperately wished to believe. This is not to denigrate the very real achievements of the committee. The logic of the structure they created was tight and useful. The flaws of the report are in what was left out rather than what was included. And one element that was left out was consideration of the individual student.

But there were still gaps in the structure through which a determined student could move. One advantage of a curricular structure defined in academic terms is that a good student can outperform the system and move through it more quickly. The educational establishment began to close the gaps.

In 1899 the National Education Association set up a Committee on College Entrance Requirements that emphasized "the importance of a certain number of constants in all secondary schools and in all requirements for admission to college."[11] There were to be four units in foreign languages, two units in mathematics, two in English, one in history, and one in science. Except for the numbers and distribution of the units, this list looks very familiar still. The next year the College Entrance Examination Board was founded and gave its first examinations in 1901. A country-wide structure for admissions was established (the first SATs were given in 1926 and the first Achievement Tests in 1937).

Then, in 1906, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching put the final nail in the structure of conformity. It defined "college" in terms of the academic units required for admission. The bookkeeping system known as Carnegie units took over the role of defining high school-college articulation. Since a unit was a year's work, four units in English determined the length of the high school course, and the thousands of students in American schools today who spend a senior year working off the necessary fourth unit have the 1906 decision to thank.

Ironically, the creation of the unit system was for the purpose of distinguishing between a school and a college so that the foundation could establish a free pension system for college teachers. It had nothing to do with school-college relationships.

But it was not the academic lockstep of high school that provided the final capstone to the K-12 structure.

All of the attention paid to the four years of secondary school had taken some of the pressure off the elementary and junior high schools. Once the secondary school had been a variable transitional program to take a child from elementary school and prepare him for college. Now that the secondary school had been graded into four discrete years, it meant that an individual student could "skip" earlier grades when he or she showed a mastery of language or mathematical skills. It was not an uncommon practice through the 20s and early 30s to find a fairly large number of students arriving at ninth grade by the age of 12. Moreover, parents had a good deal of choice as to when to start their children in kindergarten or first grade, depending on the school system.

It was actually the addition of nonacademic goals to the school system that brought the last restrictions. The progressive movement of the early part of this century had a great influence in shifting the purposes away from the academic goals of the 1893 Committee to the famous 1918 list of Cardinal Principles of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education: 1. Health, 2. Command of fundamental processes, 3. Worthy home-membership, 4. Vocation, 5. Citizenship, 6. Worthy use of leisure, 7. Ethical character. Along with the shift of goals came the arguments about students remaining within their social and age groupings. Peer learning was obviously an important part of the ethical, moral, and socializing goals of the Cardinal Principles. A student could best adapt, or learn to adapt, to his social role among students of his own maturity level. Now the "modern parent" held his child back even when the teachers suggested that the child be skipped a grade or more. "Adjustment problems" were bound to occur. And in the now-rigid system, the child who skipped was indeed considered "different" by his peers and did indeed often have adjustment problems. The school had begun to act as a substitute for apprenticeship systems of earlier eras and also to keep unemployed youths off the street. Attendance was required until the age of 16 (18 in California).

By 1930 the entire structure was firmly in place and hallowed as tradition—perhaps the quickest to develop in the history of world education. But even during the previous decade efforts had begun to reassert the rights of students to move along with the freedom that is the genuine tradition of English and American education. These efforts continue today, and are growing into a major movement which, if handled with care, can achieve the best goals of all

of the commissions and committees that have worked on the problems of American education during the past 80 years.

The Avoidance of Waste

It is not the purpose of this study to urge the adoption of any one structure of school-college articulation. The problem of so many reports in recent years has been that they have tried to do away with the present system by suggesting a new one to take its place. The goal of any educational system is to allow a student to move at his or her best speed, using all the information we have gained about learning rates, peer groups, achievement tests, ego development, etc., and placing that knowledge in the context of our present society. Some young people are "16 going on 30," and there are others "20 going on 10." Children mature at different rates just as they learn at different rates. Ego development may or may not coincide with physical maturity. Learning maturity in one area does not equate with concept mastery in another. Peer groups exist that we disregard at great peril to the student.

But all educators should share a desire to avoid waste in the development of the young people in their charge. And waste can appear in many ways and at different levels. There is waste when a student is held back from the kind of intellectual pursuit of which he is capable. There is just as much waste when a student is moved into a social situation on campus that causes psychological problems, worries, alienation, and all the related issues, whether that situation keeps him from doing his academic work or not. And—a point that is all too often overlooked—a particular high school situation may be just as harmful to an individual within his peer group as a move to college with different peers may be.

Some students probably ought to be in college by 14, under certain circumstances; some should not be in college until they are 20, or even years later. It is not my argument that the last year or the last two years of high school should be totally eliminated, but simply that a great many students should be doing college work much earlier than they are now. I also believe that colleges and schools should not embark on new programs without being precise and clear about what it is they are trying to do and why. The models are already present to be learned from.

Movements for Change

In 1929, Ralph Maynard Hutchins became president of the University of Chicago, and that is as good a symbolic moment as any to use as the beginning of the movement to break the lockstep that had rigidified American education.

The truth is that an entirely different system from the K-12-College arrangement was already established in southern California. Apparently stemming from a theory of Dr. William Proctor of Stanford University, the new system called for a 6-4-4 system through the associate degree level. In Pasadena, John W. Harbison brought the plan to life slowly and carefully.[12] In 1924 one year was added to the high school, the next year another year was added and the Associate in Arts degree was awarded. The following year the ninth grade was dropped, and in 1927 the tenth grade. Pasadena Junior College (later changed to Pasadena City College) was born. The junior college title covered all the grades 11 through 14, and the institution was the first "middle college" in America, although that title was not coined until a similar structure was put together in Massachusetts in the mid 60s.

The problems of the new college were ones that have been discovered in other experiments since, and their solutions were also similar. Parents felt that the eleventh graders (16-year-olds) were not treated strictly enough, since the college regulations applied to all students equally. Special counselors were appointed, including two assistant deans—one of women and one of men. Class advisers were chosen to work closely with the students. A full freshman orientation program for the first semester was established, with faculty members leading the sessions, which included various kinds of testing and discussions of vocational opportunities, college transfer possibilities, and general problems of college life. Students who were not from Pasadena were housed in carefully chosen private homes as boarders, and the deans had to referee the disputes that arose over students' having too many visitors, staying out too late at night, and so on.

The faculty taught at all four grade levels and soon found that they could teach the 16-year-olds and the 19-year-olds in the same way. If there was a pedagogical side effect, it was that the experience with the younger students helped pedagogically with approaches with the older students. Special courses in social science, English, and physics helped students move to college work more

quickly. The faculty soon discovered that beginning courses stressing modes of inquiry were particularly beneficial. Students went on to a wide range of colleges for their last two years (in the early days the largest group went to UCLA; in more recent years to places like Los Angeles State and Cal Poly) and did particularly well there since they had already been "doing college work" for four years. The college was made up of both college track and vocational track students, and there was an easy flow between the tracks, not only of elective courses, but of changing goals and personal friendships.

Students could "speed up" by taking overloads, but there was no great pressure to do so since they could choose advanced courses in all areas whenever they were ready for them.

The idea expanded, both within Pasadena (John Muir Junior College was founded on the same principle in 1947) and also in Ventura and Stockton for a while. During the Depression, the enrollment increased steadily as the once prosperous community became less so. During World War II the structure of the college (and the comparative youth of its students) saved its life. But the pressures against it remained strong. The California requirement of 18 as the age to which students must remain in school meant that many students had to be treated differently; the college could not just get rid of those who did not want to be there. Athletics was always a difficulty as the teams bridged the age range of traditional high schools and colleges. There remained a good deal of parent sentiment against placing together high school- and college-age students, a result both of the influx of families from other communities and the fact that other school systems did not move in the same direction. The low esteem in which community colleges were held in those years was also undoubtedly important.

By 1954 the pressures became too great and the system returned to the traditional structure, although the high school remained on the same campus as the junior college until 1960. One could conjecture that the pressure of increased competition, due to the population explosion, for openings in college and university freshman classes was the important added pressure.

At any rate, one of the important reactions to the "traditional" structure had proved its worth over a period of nearly 30 years, and teachers who had worked within the "middle college" framework often bemoan the demise of the program.

The astonishing element of the whole affair is the fact that so successful a structural change should have received so little na-

tional attention and should disappear from educational discussion so quickly and completely. The Pasadena achievement is not mentioned in any of the published discussions of high school-college articulation in the past 30 years.

It was not until about 1941 that the University of Chicago began admitting students from the tenth grade, but the first of the major studies on high school-college articulation had been done nearly 10 years before that.

Between 1932 and 1940 the Progressive Education Association conducted an investigation, described by Wilford M. Aiken in his book *The Story of the Eight-Year Study*. The important point made by the study was that "Success in a liberal arts college does *not* depend upon the study of certain subjects for a certain period in high school."[13] Basically, it destroyed much of the rationale of the Committee of 10 and the Carnegie unit system. It is hard to believe that anyone still doubts the conclusions of the study, but a tradition, even a short-lived one, is difficult to abolish. The fact that Hutchins' tenth graders did very well indeed at the University of Chicago did nothing to convert those who did not want to believe.

In 1948 the Educational Testing Service was established, jointly sponsored by the College Board, the American Council on Education, and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. For the first time a group existed to develop tests not only for college admissions but also of achievement at all levels of education. This meant, among other things, that individual students could begin to find ways to break through the rigid system if they received guidance from teachers and counselors who knew the right pathways.

The Fund for the Advancement of Education, established by the Ford Foundation in 1951, moved more directly and more quickly, however. "In the fall of 1951, eleven American colleges and universities opened their doors to 420 freshmen who differed from the average college freshman in two striking respects: they were roughly two years younger and only a few of them had finished high school."[14] For five years the Fund supported a large number of scholarship students at twelve colleges, and in 1957 published a very important study of the first four classes: *They Went to College Early*. Because the volume is almost impossible to find, and the detailed analysis of the program should be studied by anyone who wishes to know more about early admissions or has any doubts about the value of such programs, the book should be republished.

The colleges involved ranged from the obvious ones of the University of Chicago and Shimer College (both of which had already had extensive experience with early admissions) through state universities like Utah and Wisconsin, through black colleges like Fisk and Morehouse, to somewhat different institutions like Goucher, Lafayette, Louisville, and Oberlin, to Yale and Columbia. The students were representative of the college-bound population as a whole, except that they scored better on scholastic aptitude tests than the average student enrolled at each of the colleges involved in the study. (The exception was Shimer College, which purposely chose a sample group that covered the whole range of academic achievement.)

The Educational Testing Service developed the evaluation program, using a carefully selected group of comparison students on each campus that matched the Ford Scholars exactly on academic aptitude but differed on the critical issues of their ages and completion of high school work. There were two other, independent, evaluation studies, under the direction of psychiatrists at Harvard and Yale, in one case, and by the College Board in the other case, that dealt with social and perceptual adjustment of the early admission students.

Briefly put, the results were so good and so conclusive that it remains unclear as to why everyone did not move immediately into early admission programs. The students not only clearly outperformed the regular college freshmen in each institution but also outperformed the comparison students in each case. No one who has any experience with early admissions or early college students will be surprised by that fact, but other teachers might well be. The astonishing fact is that in interview situations with secondary school and college faculty who do remember the report in one way or another, I ran into the almost universal statement that the Ford experiment showed that the early admission students had a very difficult time because of their youth and immaturity. Not so. The results were exactly the opposite. They adapted well and easily – at least as easily as their older freshman counterparts, and they argued that they should be treated exactly the same as the older students. The evaluation studies show that their perceptions of their own ability to adapt to college were accurate.

Why, then, did such a conclusive study simply disappear, leaving almost no sign of its existence or of the validity of the experiment? In my more cynical moments I genuinely believe that every suc-

cessful experiment in American education is almost immediately voted out by faculties and/or the educational establishment. The reason is usually that it takes more effort, but sometimes it seems to be the perverse conservatism of people in education. Probably the more nearly accurate explanation in this particular instance is that the flood of students began reaching the colleges, and all nontraditional paths of entry were simply blocked by the swelling tide of those coming out of the twelfth grade.

Two other projects supported by the Fund for the Advancement of Education included a joint effort of faculty from three schools (Andover, Exeter, and Lawrenceville) and three universities (Harvard, Yale, and Princeton) which culminated in the 1952 report, *General Education in School and College*. Its purpose was "to seek out the present weaknesses in curricular arrangements for the eleventh through the fourteenth grades and to devise alternative arrangements that would ease the transition from school to college by treating the last two years of secondary school and the first two years of college as a continuous process, conceived as a whole."[15]

The report suggested ways to cut at least one year out of the system. Growing out of those discussions in 1951 was another project that included 12 schools and 12 colleges. This project resulted in the Advanced Placement Program, started in 1955, which now provides college credit for high school students across the country. One element in the early discussions on Advanced Placement failed to materialize from the start, however. The plan was that the schools would actively recommend those students who were ready for college as early admission candidates at the same time that the colleges would award degree credit for other students who took AP courses in high school. The colleges in general held to their part of the agreement, but the schools did not.

One example of what happened in this regard is Phillips Andover. During the 40s there had been a tendency for a certain number of juniors to take advantage of early admission opportunities at various colleges. The number was never great, but it was consistent enough to be made a regular statistic in registration and enrollment data. Between 1940 and 1945, 34 Phillips students went to college as early admits. Then the number dropped off so that the Academy finally eliminated the statistic from its enrollment records. By the 60s no more than two or three students a year took advantage of early admission programs. Not only is such an action not encouraged, but requirements are phrased in such a way that a stu-

dent would not, in anything like a normal situation, be led even to consider such an action. Instead, AP courses are offered which can lead to advanced standing at many colleges, especially Harvard and Yale.

We will, of course, have reason to consider the AP program as one of the most popular methods of breaking up the traditional articulation pattern. It is simply important here to stress that in this case, as in far too many of the programs started during these decades, there was an intransigence on the part of one element of the articulation "interface" to allow for the freedom of individual student movement that has kept the "traditional" structure alive in the minds of students and parents as well as teachers and administrators.

In addition to the AP courses and examinations a later group of College Board tests, the College Level Examinations, were originally developed for use by older students to show that nontraditional experience could lead to academically verifiable knowledge that would allow for advanced standing in college. Today there are five "general" examinations that cover the areas usually designated in lower division distribution requirements and specific subject matter tests that cover more or less universal lower division course work. The initial purpose was to allow an older person with an extensive background to test his or her way out of freshman and sophomore requirements. What has happened generally is that the General Examinations have been used by students to secure advanced standing.

Several things are wrong with the College-Level Examination Program. First, there is no general agreement among colleges about what constitutes a passing score. Second, many of the General Examinations are really based on academic experience. I challenge anyone to pass the questions on the Humanities exam simply by reading good novels and poetry and travelling in Europe. I do not mean that candidates have to take specific courses to do well on the test, but they have to have read critical texts and secondary materials similar to those they would have encountered in college coursework.

A third charge must be laid at the doors of the College Board itself. It does not present to the academic world anything like a united front regarding the virtues of the CLEP exams. It would be hard to find a College Board official who would, off the record – or in many cases on the record – say that the CLEP examinations are as

valid as the AP exams. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that colleges to which bright young students want to apply do not give credit for CLEP exams or encourage secondary school students to take them.

The "Four School Study"

Two studies that occurred during the late 60s and early 70s went back to much of the record outlined above. Anyone at all concerned with new methods of articulation between high school and college must read those documents to understand how important it is to American education to find new ways of working out articulation methods and structures. The first is the justly famous "Four School Study," *16-20: The Liberal Education of an Age Group*, by representatives from Andover, Exeter, Lawrenceville, and The Hill. It was written by Harlan Hanson, and published by the College Board. A rationale was developed for a new kind of institution covering grades 11-14, based on an analysis of a readily identifiable peer group between the ages of 16 and 20. Matters of maturity, academic ability, responsibility for action, necessity of interaction with the real world, and a number of other elements were considered. Any school or college should take all these into consideration before trying to develop a new educational program for late adolescents.

The Carnegie and New York Regents Reports

The other study, the 1973 report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education entitled *Continuity and Discontinuity/Higher Education and the Schools* (a followup study on the more famous 1971 report by the same commission called *Less Time, More Options*), lists 30 recommendations to be implemented at both levels to permit greater freedom of movement by large numbers of students. It is far more encompassing in its recommendations than any previous study and allows for all kinds of interpretations and implementation.

A short note here should also be made of two other reports. One, published in 1973 by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities: *Restructuring the Baccalaureate*, by Robert M. Bersi, focused on time-shortened degree programs, but also listed and described early and middle college models as well as early admission programs. The other, a 1974 Position Paper (No. 21) of the New York State Regents, entitled *The Articulation of Secondary and Postsecondary Education*, summarizes the reasons for closer

articulation and for increased opportunities for students to move ahead more quickly. The following year the New York State Education Department published a followup document, *Linking Schools and Colleges*, which is an inventory of the various programs available in New York State for easier articulation between school and college.

Most of these reports pay special attention to one institution—Simon's Rock Early College.

Recent Developments

Four other developments should be noted here. One is the rapid growth of high school-college interchanges of students, faculty, and courses. Individual classes have long been offered by colleges for students in high schools in their neighboring regions. Usually these have been language and mathematics courses for students who have exhausted the resources of the schools' faculty. Typically, these classes have been offered on the college campus for groups that are bussed to the campus. In other cases college faculty have been freed from some duties at their college—or paid an extra stipend—to teach a college level class at a local high school.

The newest trend is for a college to develop a transportable, in some cases a "canned" course to be taught by a high school teacher who is given "adjunct" faculty status. Students normally pay an extra fee for the credit hours awarded by the college and receive a college transcript that has real academic currency since it bears the stamp of the "club." (In this regard higher education is not very different from the chummy understanding we often decry among members of the United States Senate.)

Perhaps most important in the long run are the rapid changes in educational requirements that issue from state legislatures and boards of education. In 1972 New York adopted an all-inclusive policy that any student accepted by an accredited college on completion of eleventh grade may receive a high school diploma on successful completion of the first year of college.[16] This does not mean that a high school must grant the diploma, a fact that still holds many students at their desks for an extra year, completing that inevitable fourth unit of English. But parents and students alike are going to wake up soon to the fact that no one ever looks at that high school diploma again. Its value is in the right to write it down on an application for a job, not the framed memento.

In California as late as 1974 two students were refused entrance

to Sonoma County Junior College because of their age and lack of a high school diploma. With some splendid legal support from the Youth Law Center in San Francisco they won their case and went on with their education. But now there would be a much easier way. Any 16-year-old may, after completing the tenth grade, take a high school diploma test. The idea was basically to let students get out of school and go to work when they had honestly reached the point of diminishing returns in their schooling. But the implications for high school/college articulation are equally great. On passing the test, a student may apply to any of the three branches of higher education in the state: the junior colleges, the state universities, or the University of California. Their grade point averages *up to the point of taking the exam* determine their acceptance in the state higher education hierarchy. At this time, very few students seem to be taking advantage of this newly-opened opportunity to move on. But once the implications are fully realized, it is difficult not to imagine a sizable contingent of younger than normal students hitting the campuses. There is no indication that the colleges are considering what their proper response should be in the way of curricular and support services. Two years ago an NBC poll discovered that an overwhelming number of students in San Francisco saw as their chief reason for staying in high school for the twelfth grade the opportunity to watch interscholastic sports. It seems unlikely that this will be much of a magnet to bright students once they realize the door to college is open.

In 1976 North Carolina opened another door that many people in education have been watching either with anticipation or anxiety depending on their point of view: the General Education Development (GED) test. Based on the old Army aptitude tests of World War II, the GED has been used for years in all the 50 states as a method of gaining a high school equivalency diploma by students who for one reason or another left high school without finishing. The basic rule has been that anyone 18 years old or over whose class had already graduated from high school could take the examination and receive the diploma if a passing grade is made. Years of experience have indicated that the GED certificate is equally valid in indicating probable success in college as is the usual high school diploma. Therefore, restrictions on age and class completion can be regarded only as a means of keeping students in the high school classroom rather than allowing them to move on.

Now young people in North Carolina can take the GED test at 16.

As most colleges and universities have honored the GED certificate in the past, there would seem to be no reason why they will not continue to do so. The only remaining question is whether the colleges will retreat from a policy of accepting the diploma as the entry requirement and require something more specific, such as the Carnegie units or their equivalent.

New Jersey has dealt a telling blow to the unit system. In 1973 the State Board of Education decided that differentiation among kinds of courses for purposes of graduation unit requirements was wrong. Thus all coursework now counts at the same level. The result is that, although each school system can set its own total number of units required for graduation, it cannot define them. Gym and home economics count as much as English. Whatever one may think of the idea of those equivalencies, the new requirement does mean that a conscientious student need no longer spend four years in a New Jersey high school. The fourth Carnegie unit of English has lost its stranglehold in New Jersey! That other states will make similar changes seems reasonably certain. Whether colleges will support the new freedoms made possible by these changes in state laws remains to be seen.

Last in this general discussion of methods adopted through the years to permit greater freedom of movement for the individual student through the break from high school to college is the four year college in Great Barrington, Massachusetts—Simon's Rock. Starting in 1966 as a middle college similar to the one in Pasadena, it now offers to students in the peer group 16-20 the greatest flexibility of choice. It employs the concept of early admissions, peer group support, GED and CLEP testing for verification of achievement, strong guidance systems, interdisciplinary programs, and genuine responsibility within the committee system of the college. In short, it combines almost all the elements of the other plans and structures. It is not surprising that the Four School Study ends with the advice to others to examine that institution, or that *Continuity and Discontinuity* lists as one of its recommended models the middle college program at Simon's Rock.

One of the virtues of Simon's Rock is its full evaluation program, made possible by grants from Carnegie Corporation and the National Science Foundation. That program has provided much information with which to test other early college and early admission programs, and that is one of the purposes of the study that follows.

Footnotes

1. Ewald B. Nyquist, *Conference Reporter* (New York State Education Department, May 1975), p. 1.
2. Theodore R. Sizer, *Secondary Schools at the Turn of the Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1964), p. 5.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 45.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 223.
7. Nyquist, p. 2.
8. Sizer, pp. 106-7.
9. 1910 statement quoted in Sizer, p. 183.
10. Sizer, p. 183.
11. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *Continuity and Discontinuity* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973), p. 14.
12. The information on the Pasadena model is from Dr. Katharine Robbins who served at Pasadena College from 1923 to 1965, as a teacher, as Dean of Women, Assistant Principal, and President. Her enthusiasm and spirit were reasons for the program's success.
13. The summary statement is made in *Continuity and Discontinuity*, p. 21. Aiken's description is full and still of value, but it misses the fact that a number of students were given special early admission chances under the study.
14. The Fund for the Advancement of Education Report (No. 2), *They Went to College Early* (New York: The Fund for the Advancement of Education, 1957), p. 1.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 2.
16. New Jersey instituted a similar plan in 1970.

Reasons for a Change

Inherent in the historical discussion of high school-college articulation is the fact that current dissatisfaction with the present structure is a recognition that its inadequacies and drawbacks result from the monolithic nature of the structure itself. Individual differences among students are simply overlooked. "Tracking" large groups of students either by test scores or by postsecondary objectives is not a remedy and may even cause greater harm because the tracks do not conform to differences in maturity, learning rates, motivation, and so on, of the students.

But there are very specific reasons for seeking new ways of articulation today, and they are sufficiently important for us to consider them most carefully. They can be divided into two categories: educational and financial.

Educational

At the time that the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education was making its series of reports and recommendations to American colleges and universities, Dr. Clark Kerr, Chairman of the Commission, was quick to point out that up to two-thirds of the last two years of high school and the first two years of college were repetitious. I do not believe that anyone who knows the present state of the curriculums of the schools and colleges would question that criticism.[1] There would be those who might argue that the college courses are often taught at a higher level of expectation, but that could be proved only in specific colleges or schools. Moreover, it could just as easily be argued, and I would do so, that in any case, why not give the student the better course the first time and eliminate the duplication?

The matter of repetition is tremendously important. Often the same texts are used at both levels, the same novels and plays are read, the same experiments performed. The negative effect on the students is twofold. If a student is aware of what the freshman year at college is like, he knows he is going to go through the material twice and therefore pays less attention to, and is less involved in, the high school courses. If he arrives at college without knowing it beforehand, and discovers he is going over the same material a second time, he is bored, unhappy, and disillusioned. Much of the momentum and enthusiasm that should accompany the beginning of a new venture is dissipated. In either case there is waste, both for the student and for the institution.

As far as I know, no one has studied the effect of the student's

knowledge of the wasted time and effort on either the declining SAT scores among high school seniors or on the poor performance of many college freshmen – continually decried by college faculty. They blame the students or the system for a lack of preparation when in fact well-warranted boredom may be the real villain.

One of the saddest things about this nearly universal repetition is that the better the student and the better the schools involved, the greater the repetition is likely to be. It is likely that the secondary school teacher will have been better prepared, have far more teaching experience, and show more interest in and care for the student than the college instructor, who is likely either a graduate student trying to finish his own graduate degree or a newly-graduated Ph.D., fresh from years of graduate seminars with other students in their mid-20s and having little or no teaching experience. As in so many situations in American education, the brightest and the best students are often the ones most hurt by the system.

Part of the problem is what high school teachers have long called "senioritis." It has many roots, but the results are the same – whole classes of students working at their lowest levels of ability, taking the one or two courses they need to complete diploma requirements, wasting their time in makeshift courses and study halls and in student lounges, snack bars, and so on, or, in more liberal schools, sitting outside in good weather, smoking. It would be difficult to parody the situation of the senior year in thousands of high schools across the country. The reality exceeds the parody. A 1974-75 study in New York State showed that one out of four high school students had completed all requirements for graduation except English and physical education by the end of eleventh grade.

Attempts by many good schools to "jazz up" their offerings at the senior level, with modular scheduling, elective courses, mini-course opportunities, and a host of other inventions do not seem to have had anything but short-term results, probably as a result of the "Hawthorne effect." Basically they do not get at the real problem: students are ready for college work and do not want to continue in a high school atmosphere.

The experience of Simon's Rock and other colleges that have worked with 16-year-olds in early entrance situations shows that limiting the criticism to the senior year is a mistake. Many students are ready to go on to college at 16, the age at which most boys and girls grow into a new set of developmental patterns. Ask any tenth grade teacher about the difference between the children who enter

that year in September and the young adults who leave in June. Or visit a high school in October and again in May and simply look at the physical difference and behavior difference in the tenth graders that occurs. It may be difficult to put one's finger on the exact nature of the change, but occur it does. Yet the school system in almost every way "says" to the student that he or she is the same. Instead of tenth grade English, the student takes eleventh grade English, and so on. When a person knows, either consciously or unconsciously, that he or she has changed, it is a deadening experience to be treated as before.

I believe that the killing of most students' spirits takes place in the eleventh grade, not because of any particular act on the part of teachers or administrators, but because of the rigidity of the system itself. In most cases the effect is not noticed until twelfth grade. The student returns in September with the overwhelming knowledge that it's going to be another year of the same old thing.

I believe that educators who are worrying about and studying the decline in Scholastic Aptitude Test scores are not looking at the primary problem. College Board officials do not often mention the fact that Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test (PSAT) scores have remained constant through the years while the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores have declined. I think it is a crucial point. Most students take the PSAT during the eleventh grade. If, as the evidence indicates, the students are bored out of their minds in twelfth grade, it should not surprise anyone if the tests given during that year show a score decline. One of the statistical fictions (I do not question the truth of the figures) connected with SAT test-taking is that a student will increase his scores by 50 points a year. In four years of studying individual student scores on retests of SAT exams, I found this to be at best an isolated occurrence. Scores of large groups of students may show such increases, leading to the statistical conclusion, but I have found no basis for making any such statement about an individual student.

The evidence of readiness for college work by 16 or 17 is overwhelming, both historically and statistically. The record of early admission students during the Eight-Year Study, at the University of Chicago and Shimer College, at all of the colleges involved in the Ford Early Admissions Program, at Simon's Rock, the New School for Social Research, the Freshman Honors Program at the University of Delaware, at hundreds of colleges across the country which have taken early admissions students through the years, in AP pro-

grams, and so on, all show that there is no doubt of that fact.

The general problem of high school-college overlap is not going to go away, nor is any statement about upgrading college courses to do away with the overlap going to be very helpful. The truth of the matter is—and everyone knowledgeable in education knows it—that the differences among high schools is nearly as great as the differences among individual students. And the same is true of colleges, indeed among courses within a college and among sections of courses, especially at the freshman level. A high school may provide excellent training in science and very poor training in English, or the reverse. A student may have been carried through a beginning college level calculus course and not have been required to write a term paper in twelfth grade English. Judgments by colleges about high schools may be inaccurate because a good student may be able to do better than everyone else in his class in a poor school system and be ready for advanced placement in college.

As colleges now admit a wide range of students, it is not feasible to assume that all students are capable of a much higher level of performance than today's freshman courses. Certainly performance on SATs will not be a way of judging that preparation. Some disparities can be handled by establishing remedial programs to upgrade students with weaknesses, but there are limitations as to how far that approach can be pushed without student and parental rebellion.

The obvious answer is to admit students to college when they are ready for it, and to permit advanced placement easily and automatically when appropriate.

The process must be opened in both directions.

It should be added that the answer does not lie in the accreditation process either. One of the baffling situations in American education is the lack of knowledge on the part of teachers, students, parents, boards of education, and boards of trustees about the meaning of regional accreditation. This is in spite of the fact that almost all secondary and postsecondary institutions are regularly involved in the process.

Accreditation is based on an institution's own description of itself, not on an external set of standards; thus a visiting team does not examine an institution with an established set of rules. It reads the institution's description of itself, both in its self-study and in its published material, and decides whether the way it describes itself is accurate. Because there is such a variety of institutions, there is

no way that accreditation in itself can solve the problem of articulation. There is even less chance that diploma and degree-granting powers given by state boards can do so either. Later in this book, we shall examine both accreditation and degree-granting processes in greater detail.

Academic preparation is not the only matter of concern in early college entrance. Maturity is important, maybe equally so. But here again, the evidence has accumulated in recent decades that many young people are ready for college earlier than the system allows. It is worth quoting at length a 1970 statement by Yale's Professor Kenneth Kenniston:

Since the turn of the century, the average amount of education received by each student group has increased by approximately one year per decade. Also, the average age for the onset of puberty has decreased by approximately one-fifth of a year per decade. Finally, the average student of a given age today appears to score approximately one standard deviation above the average student of the same age a generation ago on most standardized measures of intellectual performance. A student in the middle of his class today would probably have stood in approximately the top 15 percent a generation ago. . . . Translated into individual terms, this means that the average 16-year old of today, compared with the 16-year old of 1920, would probably have reached puberty one year earlier, have received . . . more education, and be performing intellectually at the same level as a 17- or 18-year-old in 1920. [2] Our young people of 16 and 17 are certainly far more mature physically than their parents and grandparents were at the same age. With all its drawbacks, television has provided them with knowledge of the world that is much more comprehensive than children had a generation ago. They have more personal freedom than ever before and have been placed in positions requiring far greater choices, and they have more options than formerly. They have had to struggle in their early teens with personal decisions that their parents did not have to face until five or six years later. I do not mean to argue here the relative merits of the change. The point is that the young people of today have had to face maturity problems that put them in a position of responsibility years earlier than the present age for entering college. The drop in the voting age to 18 has placed young people in a different role; all these changes have coalesced to increase the pressures for beginning college work earlier.

Many of the factors have resulted from the educational ferment

of the 60s. It is not surprising that many of the institutions that have led the way in early college work began in the 60s. Unfortunately, the stresses of that period often resulted in the founding of programs and institutions without considering sufficiently all the problems involved.

Because his or her experience with sex or drugs makes continuing in high school difficult for both the student and the school is not a good reason to put a student in college. Nor is it a sufficient reason to give a student nearly complete say in the structure of his education just because he threatens to burn something down if the college doesn't agree.

But today America has drawn back too far from the excesses of the 60s, forgetting some of the valuable experiences of that decade. Student participation in governance did help to bring about far more exciting classroom situations. The cry for relevance helped show both schools and colleges the potential value of off-campus experiences. And many institutions found that permitting students greater freedom of movement led to remarkable and unexpected achievement by some students.

Much of the pressure for early college experience did come from the ferment in educational planning in the 60s. Handled with care and perception, that movement may become the greatest legacy of the decade.[3]

Financial

Perhaps the primary driving force behind the movement to allow for greater freedom of passage between school and college is the inflationary spiral that is affecting both wages and taxes. The pressure is so great that it is only the apparent conspiracy of silence about the new possibilities that would seem to be holding back the flood. I hope the deluge waits until both schools and colleges are ready.

We can see the pressures best by looking at the situation in three ways: from the parents' point of view, from the taxpayers' and school boards' position, and from the colleges' situation (both public and private). Let us consider first the parent who is able to consider some form of private secondary schooling (independent or religious) and college, with or without some scholarship aid. Tuitions differ slightly from region to region, but basically a parent is going to have to face a bill of between $4,500 and $6,500 a year if the child is in a boarding situation, and around $1,000 less than that if the child

remains at home. Most parents, when they compute educational expenses, do not consider the fact that they are paying living expenses in food, clothing, travel, allowances, and so on, for their children all the time. I talked to one parent who had worked out in great detail how much he saved in living expenses by sending his daughter away to school, where he could limit her spendings more than he could at home. In the years ahead, fewer and fewer parents are going to be able to spend the amount of money needed for eight years. Any reduction in time will result not only in savings but in a greater choice of where the child might go to school and college.

The question then becomes: What kind of speeding up is the best answer for the child and the parent? If money is an overwhelming problem, then it would be better to have the child earn some college credit while in high school and spend one year less in college.

But there is a "Catch-22" to the situation that parents should know about. Some colleges accept students for advanced standing on the basis of AP exams, but the student has to pay four years' tuition even though the degree is granted after three years!

If the parent is paying for both secondary school and college, or if he feels that the four year college experience is much more valuable than the full high school program, some form of early admission would be a better answer. In programs like Simon's Rock, the New School, or Matteo-Ricci College, two years of schooling costs can be eliminated. A combination of the Calasanctius School in Buffalo and an advanced standing program can eliminate three years!

Some parents may feel that independent secondary school education is more valuable than private college. Shortening the whole process can allow for three years of private school followed by early entrance or even a time-shortened degree program at an institution like SUNY-Geneseo. Or in California, a superior piece of work at an independent school, followed by the diploma test can open the way to early entrance at the University of California or one of the state universities.

The point is that parents may be forced to treat their children's education in a freer way because of the increasing pressure of skyrocketing school and college costs. A word of warning to schools and colleges is in order: do not expect to raise the number of applications significantly by talking about the money to be saved. Americans in general do not like to be perceived as saving money by reducing or downgrading their children's educations, no matter what they may think privately!

Taxpayer revolts against school budgets have become annual rites in school systems throughout the United States. In one town where I lived for a while, it took a minimum of three votes each year before a budget was finally approved. As the population grows older (and therefore has proportionately fewer voters who are parents of school age children) and the actual number of students in the classrooms decreases during the remainder of this century, the rebellion will become greater.

Not only are the school boards tiring of the annual fights but the boards themselves are more and more being made up of rebellious citizens. They will be searching for new answers either to hold costs constant or to decrease them. A plan that will either cut enrollments even more—such as doing away with the twelfth grade—or that will add the benefits of courses that will eliminate a year of college, such a plan will find considerable support. The unions, of course, will fight such measures with all their might because it will mean a reduction in faculty unless that faculty is qualified to teach college level courses.

Cutting a year from a four-year high school will not, of course, reduce its budget by one quarter. The range of laboratory courses and equipment, and so on, must remain extensive. Moreover, state funds, which are based on enrollment figures, will also be reduced (a growing reason, I would submit, that state legislatures will increasingly press for many of the changes that have been mentioned). Moreover, a complete dropping of the senior year will not be feasible because many students will require the extra time to finish their preparation for college or for jobs.

But that new approaches will cut costs is not to be seriously questioned, and schools must quickly develop plans that will use those approaches for the benefit of their students, as last-ditch battles to maintain the *status quo* will only hurt them.

Independent schools are in an even greater bind. Threatened already by decreasing numbers of potential students because of lower birth rates, faced by the necessity of raising their fees, they may face the necessity of seeing many of their students take advantage of early admission programs. At the same time, they may find that new opportunities are opening up for them that could lead to a new era of success and perhaps even expansion. Parents with fewer children may be more willing to pay for at least a year or two of private education if they are convinced that it is qualitatively better. Programs of college level courses like AP or the International Bac-

calaureate that guarantee advanced standing in college may draw even more students. A willingness to prepare students for college in three years instead of four may entice more families into the independent school world.

Above all, the middle college program suggested by the Four School Study may allow schools to expand through grade 13 or 14 at the same time that the secondary diploma program is reduced by a year. The academy proved in the late 19th century that it could adapt well to a new set of educational structures. The better independent schools of this generation had better show the same adaptability.

In September 1976, college enrollments decreased slightly for the first time since World War II. This is only the front edge of a number of years of projected decreases. Already a number of colleges have closed, others have merged or been swallowed up by large institutions, and academic prophets have predicted that at least 10 percent of all colleges and universities will have closed by the end of the century. Colleges in general are now seeking to stabilize enrollments rather than to grow. The competition, already fierce, will inevitably increase.

Admissions officers will try to increase their college's pool of applicants by recruiting younger students. Where this is combined with careful plans for handling those students, the benefits will be great. But where it occurs with no thought for their special needs, a great deal of harm can be done. This development has been delayed so far by a number of factors. First, most high school guidance counselors keep college visitors away from all but senior students. In one Connecticut high school the principal has laid down the policy that no one can leave the high school before completion of the diploma and college recruiters are officially informed of that policy. Such a statement is, of course, not true, such action is probably illegal, and at some point parents will realize how much their children are being held back; but at the moment no college has challenged the position. They will.

Another factor has been the unwillingness of the faculty to change their attitude toward their own role. Younger students require more advising, more individualized teaching; in short, more attention to special needs. Faculty, especially those of whom research and publication are required, are at best hesitant to get involved in that process.

Certain colleges are already beginning to establish working rela-

tions with public and private schools whereby high school faculty members are made adjunct faculty of the college, and the students earn college credit, reported on college transcripts. In the usual arrangement, each three credit course costs the student about $50. At the moment most of the colleges involved in large scale programs of this sort, for example, Syracuse (Project Advance) or C.W. Post (SCALE), are plowing those fees back into the program so that they are not subject to criticism for trying to make money out of the endeavor. But less scrupulous institutions will join the bandwagon all too quickly. Nor is there specific evidence that either Syracuse or C. W. Post is using their programs for recruitment purposes. But, again, other institutions undoubtedly will, and there is no particular reason why they should not. If a student in high school is drawn to a college because of what has been offered to him in the way of academic advisement, use of the library, participation in college activities, while still enrolled in high school, a choice of that college for the rest of his college career is surely as well-based, or indeed better-based, than most choices of college by high school students. But there will be a temptation for colleges to pressure students into continuing, and other colleges may begin to refuse to accept the high school based courses for transfer or advanced standing, thus forcing students to continue at the first college in order to take advantage of the credit.

Again, a word of caution is called for both by parents and conscientious high school counselors. A $50 college course is a bargain at today's tuition prices, but for a family under real financial pressure, it is a bargain only if it cuts down on the cost of college. One, two, or even three such courses may not do that. Unless a student can earn at least one full semester's credits in order to secure advanced freshman standing, or, better still, a full year's credit, he will probably not be able to shorten his college career sufficiently to save very much.

But parents should always remember that any process that shortens the total time of schooling will save more money than it appears to at first. With spiraling tuition and board costs, a senior year of high school or a freshman year of college eliminated can mean a saving of up to 40 percent on the final college year because it cuts off one full year of the spiral.

Public colleges are in a special position, one that could give them a leadership role in the new articulation process. Probably the best approach would be in a limited contiguous area, although the Uni-

versity of Connecticut, working with 80 high schools and some independent schools, has begun on a statewide basis to establish high school programs offering college credit.

For colleges and universities the issue is total enrollment, not the class standing of the students. If the numbers remain relatively constant, it makes no difference if the students enter at the sophomore rather than the freshman level. Indeed, many faculty members would prefer working with upper division students anyway. If more students continue through the M. A., total enrollment might even increase.

State colleges may well be able to establish regular channels with the public schools where the choice of early college work or early admission can be a matter of individual choice and good counseling. This choice is the main intent of the New York Regents' recommendations. A massive approach to a new method of state funding that shares the available money in a fair way in the freer articulation arrangement is called for. One approach would be for the student to carry the state funding with him beginning at the eleventh grade. Another could be proportional sharing on a district basis. The answers should, of course, be worked out carefully to allow for as much preplanning on the part of the institutions as possible. But taken together, the amount of state money invested should be less because of the reduction in total student load.

The one great worry is that unless educational planning by both schools and colleges accompanies the financial planning, the full value to students and to education in general will not be realized; and the genuine step forward that is possible at this point in American education will turn into a mere changing of structure. That, of course, is desirable, but it is not all that can be achieved. The goal should be to create a system that permits each student to achieve the best possible education in the shortest possible time.

Footnotes

1. B. Everard Blanchard, in a 1971 study, found the overlap to be "40 percent of the content of high school courses in the social sciences, 35 percent in English, 24 percent in science and 21 percent in mathematics." *The Articulation of Secondary and Postsecondary Education* (New York Regents) 1974, p. 7.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
3. The New York Regents Position Paper No. 21 of 1974 has an excellent summary of reasons for new articulation processes (pp. 6-10). Mimeograph. *The Articulation of Secondary and Postsecondary Education*, State Education Department, Albany, August 1974.

Drawbacks to Change

Throughout this century there has been a strong counterforce against the trends to restore to the student freedom of movement within the system. It is too easy simply to refer to the reaction as "tradition," for there are many different elements within it. It is, therefore, important to identify some of those elements for, unless the objections to change can be challenged, they will retard efforts to effect substantive alteration of the articulation process. Unfortunately, delay will harm thoughtful and considered changes more than jerry-built and self-serving ones.

One counterforce has already been mentioned but bears repeating. Just after important experiments were carried out in the 1950s, effects of the baby boom of the Second World War began to be felt. Colleges that were willing to free their admission procedures on educational grounds found themselves confronted with a wave of potential students that threatened to engulf them. Attempts in the early 50s by such groups as the Ford Foundation to have private colleges increase their enrollments significantly in order to take in the projected increases met stiff faculty resistance. Instead, the private colleges saw an unbeatable chance of raising admission standards markedly. One result was the quick increase in size of state college and university systems in areas, like New England, where private colleges had reigned supreme. Another was that students who did not fit the usual pattern (i.e., possess the high school diploma and correct number of Carnegie units) were put off or told to wait. I sat on the faculty of three New England colleges in the late 40s and early 50s who stuck to their limited growth plans in the face of strong pleas to make room for more students. Whether the choice was right or wrong is not the issue; the result of closing the doors to the nontraditional applicant is. Unlike some of the other forces against freer articulation, the pressure of applicants is no longer a problem, to put it mildly.

Another issue of that period is still with us, however. The unwillingness on the part of many college faculty members to believe that secondary school teachers can teach at the college level has not changed very much. Robert Frost once said that the basic difference in postlecture parties he attended in Britain and America was that in Britain, along with the college faculty, local doctors, lawyers, clergy, and businessmen, there would always be secondary school teachers; in America this latter group was never present. For easier articulation to take place for students, the inner wall of separation within the academic community must be broken down. The distrust

will never melt away until genuine conversation between the two groups of teachers begins. And the distrust is not all on one side. High school faculty also over generalize about the lack of caring by college faculty for the individual student and his or her emotional growth.

Maturity

Probably the most important argument concerning early admission to college is the social and emotional maturity of 16- and 17-year-olds. There can be no doubt that the issue is a real one. Even the Ford Early Admission Scholars in the 50s who argued that they should be treated exactly the same as other college students were almost unanimous in their judgment that students with any less than their own high academic standings should not be allowed to enter college early because of the social pressures. Boys, especially, noted their initial problems in connection with dating, dances and other social functions.

A parent of one Simon's Rock student once told me that he wished that an early college had existed when he was a young man. He had gone off to Yale at 16, and, as he put it, whenever there was a dance weekend, he went off to the woods and set traps. There was no woodsman's fervor about his remark; he was reliving the anguish of loneliness of a youngster outside his own peer group.

This was no isolated case; I have heard the equivalent story from literally hundreds of parents, male and female, who were themselves younger than usual when they entered college. Ego development tests have discovered some very real differences in this age group. They are less sure of themselves as social and sexual entities; they are more concerned with their bodies and the relationship of their bodies to the rest of themselves as persons. A far larger proportion of young people in this age group are "preconventional" in their attitudes. They have not ingested society's mores sufficiently either to accept or to move beyond them.

If worries about the ability of a 16-year-old to handle the social climate of college were strong in the 50s when college regulations were still comparatively stiff and the institution still functioned *in loco parentis*, they are even stronger now. Open dorms, an apparent lack of rules of any kind, and seemingly unlimited amounts of sex, drugs, and alcohol make parents, teachers, and administrators understandably hesitant to throw young people into that world early.

What is missing in this outlook, however, is an equally realistic

analysis of the secondary school situation. There is considerable evidence that the grade level at which drugs are endemic is seventh grade, not the freshman year of college. Marijuana is just as available in high schools as it is in college, and college drug pushers are usually supplied by the same sources as high school students. Parents who think their children are facing decisions about sex for the first time at college are either purposely and perversely blind or they aren't talking to their children openly. Documented stories of sex in high school corridors make most college faculty members' blood run cold in comparison with coed college arrangements. And I really believe most sensitive parents are aware of the amount of alcohol consumed by secondary school students.

This is not meant to support the way things are, but to encourage discussion of early college admission from a realistic point of view. Both schools and colleges must reexamine the character and quality of the life in their institutions, and it may be that a well-thought-out early admissions program that helps to foster student growth and maturity may contribute to a program with moral rigor.

Faculty Advising

College faculty as well as high school teachers also know that younger students create different stresses for those who teach them. Younger students need closer guidance, at times more structure, and clearer guidelines for action. Many people become college teachers because they do not want to worry about anything but their specific academic disciplines. Far too many resent the time necessary for advising. At universities where the rule is "publish or perish," teachers often resent any demands on their time apart from classroom work and preparation for it. But younger students need more than that. They need attention as human beings in the process of finding themselves. Academic, social, and psychological stresses are too interrelated for young people to untangle by themselves.

Special Academic Programs

In academic terms, specific disciplines are not enough either. Alfred North Whitehead was right in saying that these are the years for interdisciplinary approaches. Just as students are trying to put the various parts of themselves together, so they need to do the same with what they are learning. If, as Whitehead put it, at school "the student has been mentally bending over his desk," at college "he

should stand up and look around." He should learn to handle general ideas and see how specific facts support or call them into question. He should be urged to do independent work, but he still needs help and direction in how to do it well.

It is doubtful that the traditional college freshman is much better prepared for the off-hand treatment he usually gets than is the younger student, but colleges have been handling students that way for so long only a few really question the practice any longer.

Support Systems

Greater care for entering students is a burden for the institution, and many colleges do not wish to take it on. There are very real cost factors involved. Large freshman sections will not do; the faculty student ratio must be kept low to allow for individual attention, both in classes and in advising. There must be support systems for counseling, guidance, and so on. Special care must be used in developing social regulations and situations that will be truly helpful to the younger students. Orientation sessions; seminars on college issues; persons to whom the student can go for advice on careers, majors, and all the other aspects of a person's life in college or beyond must be made available.

Enrollment

Moreover, it would be a real mistake for any college to think that an early admissions program is an immediate answer to enrollment problems. The recruitment and admission structure in America is massive and remarkably rigid. High schools are "geared up" for placing seniors. It is sometimes difficult if not impossible to reach the sophomores and juniors. Because of the way guidance offices are structured, most students and their parents are unaware of other possibilities in the earlier years in high school. Some parents have planned financially for a specific year when college expenses will begin, and it is difficult for them to rethink those plans. They also count on guidance officers for advice on applications, financial aid possibilities, and all the other technical matters connected with college entrance.

Job Protection

One major drawback to early admission that will undoubtedly become increasingly important in the years ahead is the attitude of the teachers' unions. The recognition that any process that breaks

down the rigidity of four years of high school and four years of college will inevitably lead to fewer classes and therefore a reduction in the number of teachers has just begun to occur. Unions, already on the defensive because of the oncoming decrease in the number of children moving through the schools, will view any further decrease in teaching load as another threat. Appeals to the fact that a better education for the individual student will result are not likely to have much support when job security is threatened. I do not have any solution to offer to this problem, any more than anyone else does. But obviously the best answer is to keep the number of teachers high so that better teaching can result, and that should be the main burden of the teachers' argument. If they argue for keeping students back just so they will be able to keep their jobs, they are not likely to win much support. Those who raise the old argument of "tradition" are not likely to convince many people.

Thus, part of the answer lies in colleges and secondary schools jointly speeding up the articulation process: colleges must accept college level credits from appropriate high school courses and high schools must guide their students into appropriate early admission programs. And the faculties had better start talking to each other!

Declining Scores

One problem that no one quite knows how to deal with is the question of decreasing SAT scores. There are already those who contend that the falling scores indicate the need to spend more time – or at least the traditional amount of time – in high school in order to prepare for college better. The specious quality of this argument should be apparent to everyone but seems not to be. I am reminded of Paul Ehrlich's illustration of the pesticide company that, when it was pointed out that their product did not kill the target bug, but instead, all of that bug's enemies, issued instructions to their users to double the amount of pesticide used. If the present system is achieving diminished academic results, the solution to the problem is surely not more of the same. Especially, if I am right in judging that the side effects of the lockstep are among the principal causes of the problem.

If the high schools provide more remedial work to raise SAT levels, those students who would most benefit from moving on will be those most injured by the altered emphasis.

Tradition

The major drawback to early admission and early college work remains that of tradition. Perhaps this is seen on the independent school campus better than anywhere else, but the small liberal arts college runs a close second. Anyone who has attended a faculty meeting at these institutions recognizes the syndrome immediately: a new idea is suggested and immediately a senior member of the faculty rises to say, "In the thirty-five years I have taught at this college/school, we have heard ideas like this before and (1) have always had the good sense to vote them down; or (2) they did not work." It is difficult to argue intelligently with a person who rests his case on the fact that for two hundred years the institution has been doing something one way and doing it well. The fact that no college or school in the United States has been offering the same kind of education for more than twenty or thirty years does not really matter.

It is also important to realize that the feeling of tradition is tremendously important in the ongoing life of a first-rate institution. To decry tradition as such is to decry the basis of most superior education.

Why should a good school or college change its program when it is doing well what it seeks to do? If a school has traditionally taken its students through twelfth grade and they have done well in college, why should that school change? A similar argument could be presented for the traditional college.

The answer, of course, is first to question whether the success is due to the structure of the school and program or to the quality of the students. Would they have done as well wherever they were? Or of the faculty – would they have taught as well in any program? Secondly, and just as important – good as any program is, couldn't it be better? Are there changes that would allow students to do even better than they do now?

To illustrate: not too long ago I overheard a conversation of two very good secondary school teachers discussing the plight of a tenth grader who had taken an overload during his first term and made all As. In the second term he wanted to take a seventh course because the other six did not take up all his time and he was inclined to get in trouble when he wasn't busy. His adviser had argued with the administration and only managed to get allowance for the boy to audit the seventh course. The first teacher saw the wisdom of

this, because if he had taken the course for credit, "What would he have done for course work to fill out his senior year?" Neither teacher even considered the possibility of the student's moving through his work at a quicker pace and going to college early. This was at an excellent school – "If they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?"

Another problem with tradition is the hallowed effect on the recipient. The "If I went through it, so should they" syndrome reaches a point of almost mystic power in education. Perhaps nowhere is the *post hoc, ergo propter hoc* fallacy more at work. No matter how much a student may have rebelled against a system of education or been able to see its weaknesses, once he has graduated and become successful, he looks back indiscriminately on his experience as something that should be repeated by others.

The trick in education is to identify the genuine traditions, discover their real values and seek to preserve those.

Family Participation

Another drawback, often not mentioned, is equally powerful. It, too, is a tradition of a different sort; important and perhaps worthy of more consideration. In an evaluation visit to Simon's Rock, Frank Newman, President of the University of Rhode Island, raised the question forcefully, and I, for one, do not know the answer. I am not sure there is a general answer.

One of the criticisms of modern society and one of the reasons given for the breakdown in relations between generations is the fact that many children are simply unaware of the work that their parents, especially their fathers, do. At the same time the family structure itself has fallen apart. Many conscientious parents are concerned and trying to do something about the situation in their own families. And for those who are successful, the years of greatest pleasure in some ways are those of late adolescence, as communication between child and parent becomes genuinely adult.

Early admissions programs would, of course, take the child away from the home just at the point when, in some families, the full appreciation of child and parent can begin to occur – at the age of 16 or 17.

Not all parents are ready to let children go. This is perhaps best illustrated by an example from my own experience. A mother and father sat in my office with a tenth grader who was about to turn 16 and was considering entering Simon's Rock the next year. We had

spoken about the need for social maturity on the part of the student, and the father turned to his wife and asked, "Don't you think Robert is ready to handle this?" Her answer was: "Of course he's ready, but I'm not."

For parents who have already found boarding schools the right answer for their children, this is not a problem. For parents who, instead of experiencing increasing communication and understanding with their children at this age, have found a growing separation, this is not a problem. For those who see their children already grown up and ready to handle the world on their own (but with some good support from others), the problem is not so great.

For the rest I can only offer the statements of a number of Simon's Rock parents, that part of the benefit of permitting children to enter college early was the young people's ability and eagerness to talk to their parents more afterward. A warning is needed: to the parent who worries too much about his or her 16-year-old going off to college, the question must be asked: how much is that worry concern for the child and how much is parental selfishness or insecurity?

Requirements of the Job Market

Another drawback needs particular discussion. Because of the current unemployment rate, the unsettled economy, and the desire by many thoughtful planners for business, government, indeed all sections of the economy, to reach limited growth rates, there is a real question as to the value of speeding up the educational process. After all, if the present educational system reached its undue length partially in order to keep young people off the job market in the second half of the 19th century, why should not similar pressures exist today? It is true that many students do not want to get out into the "real world" any sooner than necessary. And some teachers' jobs would be saved by maintaining the *status quo.*

There are two answers to these objections, one obvious, the other less so. As our society becomes increasingly complex, the skills required to handle positions of responsibility become proportionally more complex, requiring more training, usually in the form of graduate training. This means that more and more students will have to spend more time in school than they have in the past unless a reduction in time occurs somewhere along the line, as would happen with new articulation methods between high schools and colleges. Some educators believe that just as the senior year of high school is

disappearing, so is the senior year of college, and a similar change in articulation at that level will soon occur, allowing students to move into graduate work after their junior year of college. This process is already beginning in both law schools and medical schools.

An equally important reason for permitting good students to accelerate lies in the changing age proportions of the total population and of the work force. As the average age of the population increases with the declining birth rate, the work force may change radically, with a larger percentage of the management positions held by older men and women who have longer experience in a company, industry, profession, and so on. It could be argued that such a situation is dangerous since progress, new ideas, and new approaches often come from younger people who are not yet moulded in previous behavior and thought patterns. The danger lies in the fact that the problems society now faces require radically new solutions. It therefore seems essential that we move a larger number of educated young people into the work force more quickly than is now possible. Both state legislatures and the Congress have already moved to delay the age of retirement, which will make the situation even worse than it already promised to be.

New Modes of Articulation

While colleges have little trouble in accepting students in early admission programs, schools face a great deal of difficulty in raising their academic offerings to college level. Basically there are two current ways of doing that "stretching." The first is to move into a national or international program of courses and examinations, i.e. Advanced Placement and the International Baccalaureate. The second is to find a college or university that either offers its facilities to the high school for gaining college credit (Project Advance, SCALE, etc.) or to make arrangements with nearby colleges for some mutually-agreed-upon program. Both of these methods, to varying degrees, have the drawback of forcing upon schools and faculties an external set of syllabi or examinations. The better the school, the less likely the faculty is to agree to it. This is not to deny the real advantages that such programs offer, not the least of which is the ability to upgrade standards and course offerings. But I find it difficult to imagine a faculty like that of Andover or Exeter – or of New Trier High School – agreeing to anything more restrictive than the AP exams.

Yet one of the major possibilities of new articulation methods is

the development of the middle college suggested by the Four School Study and exemplified in Simon's Rock.

There are two genuine stumbling blocks, and it would be unwise for any institution to underestimate their effect. The first is the degree-granting authority of state boards of higher education; the second is the difficulty of winning the support of regional accrediting agencies, especially since they seem to be becoming increasingly conservative. There are great variations in attitudes in boards from state to state, as well as equally great variations among the regional associations. Nevertheless, none is impervious to justifiable requests, reasonably presented and genuinely implemented.

Simon's Rock Early College

In September 1964, Elizabeth Hall created the machinery for an experiment in American education that brought together most of the ideas we have been discussing. Simon's Rock developed from a fortunate blend of realistic perceptions by a good educator who had seen the fallacy of continuing old methods when circumstances and students have changed, and a family foundation that permitted implementation of those new ideas in a completely original institution. In 1966 the doors opened, and 54 young girls entered the "early college" following their tenth grade in other schools.

Mrs. Hall delineated the reasons for the new institution in a series of speeches and pamphlets, the best known of which is "The House of Education Needs Overhaul." She had seen hundreds of students wasting their final two years of school in those years of bulging classes, fighting for SAT scores that would get them into the "right" colleges. She had seen the needless overlap of coursework in schools and colleges. And she had seen the speeding up of the educational system at the same time that it continued to prolong the period of academic preparation. Puberty and physical maturity were coming earlier, yet teenagers were still being treated as children. And central to her idea was an awareness that there is a genuine peer group from 16 to 20 that shared the problems of late adolescence – young people who were best able to reach maturity in the company of their peers while under the guidance of a caring faculty.

Her solution was to build a four-year program modeled academically on the traditional college program, with the freedom to concentrate in one subject area, while distributing the balance of studies in the other areas. Pedagogically there would be a double focus on the student's interest and those studies "deemed essential for the liberally educated of any age." Content would focus on the present and what was relevant to the contemporary world and the future. "Structure would endeavor always to cultivate in the student an awareness of the effect of his individual actions upon himself and others."

She was equally sure that "the rate of intellectual development can be speeded up but the rate of social and emotional maturation cannot . . . they need four more unbroken years of time in which to grow up – a chance to learn to distinguish what matters and what doesn't, what must be done at once and what can wait." She believed that "freedom of maturity lies not in the absence of restrictions" but in winning "the trust and respect of others. The subtlety of the distinction is not learned in a few lessons." The clue was in

the learning of self-restraint. Meanwhile, the social regulations for the beginning years were remarkably like those of a boarding school. The real key to the whole problem of social maturity lay, for Mrs. Hall, in the faculty. As she said in a speech to parents at the National Cathedral in Washington in 1966:

An inaccessible faculty, preoccupied with the training of mature minds, is as useless to students in search of convictions as a faculty devoid of stature. In the early college the adults could have more nearly the relationship to students that is possible in the good secondary school, in frequent association with all at a time in their lives when an association of this kind is still essential to their full emotional and social development.

In September 1966 the first class entered the four-year institution. Although all were girls, it was intended from the start to make the place coeducational, and the first boys arrived in 1970. There was no attempt to speed up the students' education, but to "tone it up." A student would graduate after four years with an Associate Degree, ready for specialization at a university, or prepared to enter the world with the A.A. degree:

It is not proposed that this should be an accelerated program, demanding from age sixteen what is now expected of students two years older. Nor would it presume to confer an equivalent of the B.A. degree at the end of a four-year span.

It must be emphasized, however, that Mrs. Hall was urging a total restructuring of American education, with high school ending at tenth grade and the university blending its last two years with the graduate program. Thus, she was proposing that the early college become the liberal arts college in the American educational structure.

Simon's Rock developed from the educational ideas of the 60s, and it also experienced the problems of the late 60s before one class could graduate. As in every school and college, drugs, with all their attendant problems, arrived on campus, and Simon's Rock gained an unfair reputation for having "flaky teenagers." Students did not, indeed, grasp the subtle difference between the lack of restrictions and the earning of respect and trust. Nor did many faculty members. The first major problem developed from the faculty demanding more voice in the running of the school: if it were to be an "early college," they wanted to act like college faculty. A major change in faculty took place at the end of the year. In the last years of the decade student rebellion (much milder than at most colleges)

led to a restructuring of the college administration: an executive committee was established to run the institution on a daily basis, although Mrs. Hall remained its president. As often happens with an organizational structure of this type, further misunderstandings and factionalism developed.

Meanwhile the college had to struggle with outside forces and misconceptions. At no time was Simon's Rock established as "the last two years of high school and the first two years of college." Yet that misconception was held nationwide, no matter what was stated in the printed materials that were distributed. There were even people in neighboring communities who thought that because the college said it was giving a four-year college program leading only to the A.A. degree, it was an institution for slow students.

There were three reasons for the image that its first two years were high school years. First, of course, was the age of the students and the fact that they entered after tenth grade. Second, administratively there were two deans of students, one for the first two years, the other for the last two years. The third reason was that the new institution, in order to protect its students, had to make sure they would receive a high school diploma by at least the end of the second year in case they left Simon's Rock early (which a great many of them did). This meant that the college first approached the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) for accreditation for its first two years as a secondary school.

In October 1969 a team for the NEASC visited the campus, and after much soul-searching and investigation, it recommended that instead of granting full accreditation to Simon's Rock's first two years as high school, the entire institution should be named as a Recognized Candidate for Accreditation as an institution of higher education. On July 18, 1969, the State Board of Higher Education granted the college the authority to award the Associate in Arts degree.

With the advent of male students in September 1970, an entirely new set of pressures developed. A decision had to be made about where to house the young men. The college had only three dormitory buildings, none small enough to house them separately. The decision was inevitable: all dorms became coeducational, with the sexes separated either by floor or by suite. Although there were no problems of the thornier kind, such as mixed bathrooms, all the other difficulties attendant on coed housing did arise. One partial solution was to house first-year students (16-year-olds) together and

to impose limited visiting hours for the first semester. Although few faculty members or administrators were happy with the situation, no other solution seemed possible. And once a liberal set of social regulations is in use, it becomes almost impossible to return to more conservative ones, a fact too often overlooked.

One of Mrs. Hall's perceptions concerning adolescents was that students who were being called upon to grow emotionally as well as academically had to be given responsibility within the structure of the college, and early on she made arrangements to do that. Adulthood calls for involvement, and even though committees end up building camels instead of horses, as the old saw goes, "if you're *on* a committee, you *feel* involved." So committee structures developed within the college that insured that all committees had either half, or nearly half, their members elected from the student body. It is not an efficient form of organization, but efficiency was not the goal. Involvement and the development of mature judgments were. I think there are few people who would question the statement that involvement in the governance structure of the college has been one of the central pillars of the success of the early college in turning younger than usual students into full college students.

There is an attendant problem that must be considered, however. Faculty members burdened with full teaching loads, heavy advising commitments, and required committee work that goes along with developing and sustaining an innovative program get tired. Committee work becomes a teaching situation. One of the most exciting educational experiences at Simon's Rock was to watch faculty members work slowly and conscientiously to make sure that student members of a committee became aware of all the issues involved before voting on a new academic program or social regulation; then, when that awareness was clear, to watch the committee shift gears and really begin to work as a committee should. But this is a long process and a wearying one. It is exhausting to have to go through the whole process again and again with a new group of students every year or two.

I first became aware of this pattern during the years of the teach-ins on Vietnam. In those who took part in these sessions in 1965, it became difficult to arouse the same level of enthusiasm for the fourth or fifth time five or six years later. But faculty members have to remember that each such event is fresh and new to the students involved. Teachers need to learn how, again and again, to approach the situation as if for the first time. It really is no differ-

ent from doing the same thing with academic material that one is teaching for the tenth or thirtieth time.

Transfer an Identity Problem

Meanwhile the "in-between" structure of the early college was presenting genuine problems for survival. If students could not accelerate at Simon's Rock (except by taking heavy overloads), why should they stay in Great Barrington for the last two years when Cambridge or New York or Berkeley lay ready to accept them? Moreover, more and more colleges showed their awareness that the education at Simon's Rock was what it claimed to be – college level. Students were being accepted after the eleventh and twelfth grades as well as after tenth, with variable credits being required for graduation depending on the point of entry. Thus in the same classroom, some were earning credits for the A.A. directly while others were earning credits that would count toward a high school certificate if they left early. When Princeton offered advanced freshman standing after one year at Simon's Rock (in age terms, the equivalent of eleventh grade), what student could resist? Other colleges offered junior standing after two years. The diversity of courses and freedom of course choices were good reasons for choosing Simon's Rock over most high schools or independent schools, but there was no special academic program to hold a student back from advanced standing at another college.

At the same time, there remained a very real doubt among many faculty members as to whether they were really teaching college courses. They were mostly young teachers in their twenties or early thirties with no previous teaching experience at the college level (most had taught in private schools) or, in some cases, no teaching experience anywhere but at Simon's Rock. That doubt communicated itself to students. The result was that more than half the student body left at the end of every year. Moreover, the college, whose attitude was to help students move at their own best speed, assisted such decisions to move on.

The fact that outsiders were quick to assure both faculty and students that the courses were clearly college level did not quell the doubts. When I first visited the campus in the spring of 1972, I sat in on as wide a variety of classes as possible, and there was no question of the quality or the level of the coursework or the classroom discussions. What was needed was both an academic structure and a degree program that would lay all doubts to rest. And the library,

that had no book budget for 1971-72, needed immediate upgrading. It was the only part of the college that had suffered severely from the institution's background within the secondary school world.

The B.A. Program

With the advent of a new president on July 1, 1972, the college moved swiftly to fulfill all the possibilities of an early college. There were no other models to follow and little support in the academic world because the new structure would be perceived as a threat to secondary schools, to junior colleges and to senior colleges. In 1970 the Four School Study had recommended Simon's Rock as a model for a middle college, but even that model had not found support among the schools sponsoring the study.

First, guidelines had to be tacitly agreed to by the Chancellor of Higher Education of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. If there were little chance of his support at a later date, an alternate line of approach would need to be developed. The guidelines were there, however, and they acted in a beneficial way on the college's development: first, Simon's Rock had to establish that its entering students were ready for college; second, an outside method of checking the progress of the students in midcareer, indicating that they were performing at college level, was needed; third, there had to be an external check that graduating students were performing at least as well as graduating seniors from recognized accredited colleges across the country; and fourth – an implication rather than a directive – Simon's Rock should offer a better education than most colleges; it should strive for excellence rather than for what would just do.

By July 13, 1972, the faculty had voted general agreement on a B.A. pilot program that would have the following characteristics. All new students would be required to take the GED tests in October, with entry into the B.A. program being dependent on passing them. A freshman program or course stressing interdisciplinary techniques or approaches would be required. In the spring of the sophomore year, students would take the CLEP general exams to indicate their progress. Each B.A. student would have to choose an interdisciplinary major and complete the requirements before graduation. During the senior year, students would take part in an interdisciplinary senior seminar, would take two comprehensive exams (written and oral) in a major field, and write a thesis – an external examiner, a senior faculty member from another accredited

college or university, would take part in the oral exam, would also read the thesis and the written examination and provide a written evaluation stating that the student's performance had been at least at the C level in comparison with graduating seniors at his own institution.

When the new students arrived in September, they discovered that a new option was open to them: a pilot B.A. program for which the college hoped it would be able to award the B.A. degree in their graduating year. It was all rather tentative, but the faculty was prepared for four hard years of work.

How much would have been possible without the support of Carnegie Corporation of New York and the National Science Foundation as well as real understanding from the staffs of the Board of Higher Education and the New England Association it is not now possible to judge. Meanwhile the administration continued to contact innovative programs in New York, like the Regents Degree Program, and California for backup possibilities should the main plan run into a major roadblock.

By January, Carnegie had awarded a $350,000 grant permitting summer faculty workshops that were of immense and probably critical value in developing the academic program. It also allowed for assistance in student recruitment, library staff and books, external examiners, and an evaluation office that was central to the college's understanding of itself, its students, and the values and problems that would be present in any other institutions that followed a similar model. From the day of its founding, Simon's Rock has sought to convince other schools and colleges of the viability of the early college idea and has encouraged other institutions to follow suit.

Meanwhile the upgrading of the library and faculty began in earnest. The new president was only the third faculty member with the doctorate when he arrived. The figure was to change to 40 percent by the next fall (1973). Library holdings increased at the rate of over 5,000 volumes a year, an increase of more than 25 percent the first year. Selection of books was done carefully and was related specifically to the teaching needs of the courses in the new program as well as the needs of independent study by individual students.

During the fall semester of the 1972-73 academic year, proposals for the interdisciplinary majors that the faculty wanted to offer were submitted to the academic affairs committee, and six majors

were approved: American studies; arts and aesthetics; English studies, environmental studies, intercultural studies (with a double focus in the European Economic Community and Latin America), and pre-medicine. A year later a major in social sciences was added.

In June 1973 the first of the summer workshops funded by Carnegie Corporation took place, allowing not only for time to develop the major programs carefully, but for working on those elements of the entire college program that evaluation office studies and faculty experience showed to be vital, such as effective advising and counseling. Receiving the major share of attention was the first year or transition year program. Helping the young student to bridge the gap from high school to college expectations proved to be an essential part of eliminating both the academic and emotional waste that Simon's Rock was established to eliminate. It was soon discovered that no perfect answer to the transition existed and that constant renewal of effort was required. There is little doubt, however, about the basic needs of such a program.

Transition Year

An orientation program before the year started always required the presence of both returning students and faculty. It provided a way of letting the new students get to know each other, the faculty, and some of the most concerned of the older students. Advising had a chance to begin in a less hurried way than is usual on most campuses. Recently the addition of Outward Bound techniques has proved especially helpful in building group spirit.

During the first semester a biweekly series of seminars is held for all new students, discussing problems of relating to college, to each other, and to themselves. Topics range from the usual ones on sex and drugs, to problems of living in dorms, relating to parents, and finding out what faculty expectations really are. No matter how carefully planned these seminars have been, they have not been very popular. This leads me to the theory of the "necessary failure."

The "Necessary Failure"

Every well thought out program I have studied for this book has some element (a special course, an advising situation, etc.) considered essential – but that does not work. Luckily, since the faculty or administration believes it to be important, everyone keeps working at it, revamping, altering, substituting. The result is that, to

some extent, it really does work. The reason for its being offered is articulated clearly to the students. They see that the faculty cares about them and the program because they keep trying. The students also get some sense of what the problems of creating a worthwhile academic program are. No one should ever give up on a program they know to be right just because it doesn't work. But the failure should be made visible by attempts to correct it.

Transition Year Requirements

First-year students must take a level 100 English course (unless they pass a modified form of the AP English examination given during orientation week) and at least one other level 100 course. All faculty have agreed that in their level 100 courses they will stress the skills of writing, reading, speaking, and critical thinking, and will not leave the teaching of those skills to be handled in the freshman English course alone.

The academic year calendar is made up of two 13 week semesters followed by a spring term of five weeks. During the second term there is a special "Majors Day" when first-year students visit presentations by the various majors in which faculty and upperclass students describe the requirements of the major, the rationale for its existence, and the lifetime or career possibilities leading from a liberal arts, interdisciplinary program of this type. First-year students are not urged to make a choice at this time, but second year students who have not yet done so must commit themselves on that day. Because of the interdisciplinary nature of the majors, the ability to move among majors is much greater than usual. Most students have decided on their major by the end of the first year.

Before the end of the second semester a new student must have chosen a subject for guided study and a faculty member to act as tutor. The subject is supposedly interdisciplinary in nature, although there is a considerable variety in the choice, the only real limits being the ability to find a faculty member who will agree to act as tutor on the subject, and the availability of books whether in the library or at one of the colleges in the area (Williams College, for example, where library privileges are extended to Simon's Rock students).

The tutor sets up a schedule for the five weeks of spring term, meets with the student at least twice a week, and makes sure the student becomes aware of and uses all the usual techniques of independent study. It is called guided study to indicate the responsibil-

ity of the faculty tutors to insure that the student goes through the process properly, not omitting any of the usual steps. The guided study papers are usually restricted to 20 pages in order to keep the subject matter limited to a topic that can be dealt with thoroughly in five weeks. On almost any other campus it would be called "independent study."

Both faculty and students consider the guided study period the most important part of the year. By the end of the five weeks every student is fully prepared for any assignment, including the senior thesis, that a faculty member is likely to require. The calendar is essential in all of this. Each student has had two full semesters of college work beforehand. He or she has learned what faculty members expect, has written up to eight semester papers, in addition to the work for level 100 English.

Accreditation and Degree-Granting Authority

By October of 1973 a visiting team of the NEASC had visited the campus, a year ahead of schedule, and recommended full accreditation. Although the only degree given at that time was the A.A., the team did examine the majors and facilities in light of the pilot B.A. program. The following spring, events moved very quickly. A visiting team from the Board of Higher Education visited the college in March 1974 with regard to the college's request to award the B.A. In May, the college was accredited. In June, the National Science Foundation gave the college nearly half a million dollars to upgrade the science laboratories and the journal holdings in the library, and to add faculty members to teach advanced courses. An office of career development, whose charge was to work with students in a purely liberal arts program to illustrate some logical career choices for them, was established.

In July 1974, after numerous reports and hearings, Simon's Rock was given B.A. degree-granting authority by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. That set the stage for a faculty workshop in the late summer to complete the revamping of graduation requirements to adhere to the form that had been envisaged since 1972. At last students in the peer group 16-20 had the full range of options for moving at their own best speed.

Students were still accepted following the tenth, eleventh, or twelfth grades. A student entering after tenth grade could earn a B.A. in four years or an A.A. in three. The reason for the extra year was that nearly 10 years of experience had shown that if a student

jumped two years ahead in a transfer situation (and many did), he or she would slow down a year, either consciously or unconsciously. He would take a year off, or transfer again, or change majors with a consequent loss of a year. The peer group effect really worked. It seemed wiser, therefore, to set requirements in such a way that the student benefited the most. Students who transferred on a one year gain basis did at least a full grade better in marks at the next college, no matter how prestigious, than at Simon's Rock.

Students entering after eleventh grade had three choices – a B.A. in four years, an A.A. in three (with no gain in time), or an A.A. in two years. Under the latter program they were required to take a more structured program than the straight A.A., whose only specific course requirement was level 100 English. They had the usual college distribution requirements, since they would be competing at other colleges with students who had entered under the more conventional early admissions programs.

Students entering after twelfth grade could only remain for two years and earn the A.A. degree. Otherwise they would go beyond the peer group of the college. Waivers were, of course, possible, especially for those who had graduated from high school early. Older students who clearly seemed to fit within the peer group were also allowed waivers, but that allowance always presents a certain problem. Twenty-one is as mystical a moment of change as is 16. I have watched students return for an extra semester after their twenty-first birthday and be supremely unhappy at being with the younger peer group. They immediately assume father or mother roles.

Some students, but very few, still request high school certification, which is given after completion of one year of work. This is similar to the New York and New Jersey regulations of awarding a high school diploma to early entrance students at the end of their freshman year of college. And other students still transfer to other colleges with advanced standing without completing any degree at Simon's Rock.

Some older students are allowed to register as fulltime students if they give evidence of being good role models for the younger college group. Certainly much older students, men or women in their thirties or above, mix marvelously in classes with the younger group. I had older students in all the classes that I taught at Simon's Rock for four years. The experience is valuable for both groups. The older students bring practical experience with them that helps to awaken the younger ones to the realities of life that

must be blended with academic experience to provide a genuine education. At the same time, the parental roles they sometimes assume blend neatly with the peer group experience of the adolescents in a nonthreatening way. The younger students bring to the older ones a freshness of inquiry and a boldness of expression that is invigorating to those who have been out of the academic pattern for a time.

In May 1976 the first students graduated from Simon's Rock with B.A.s after a four-year program following the tenth grade.

Lessons to Be Learned from Simon's Rock

What are the results of studies at Simon's Rock that provide clues to institutions seeking to offer college work within the secondary school context, deciding upon an early admission program at the college level, or venturing into a middle or early college format?

The first, it seems to me, is the need to recognize the reality of the 16-20 peer group. Sixteen-year-olds are markedly different from 15-year-olds. They need to be treated much more as adults and brought into decision-making activities. The decision-making cannot be fake, as the students are all too aware of how they have been manipulated for the previous 10 or 11 years. There are many small actions the students consider significant. The fact that they can choose courses so that an entire day is left free—with the accompanying need to do very large amounts of class preparation during that free time—is one of the quickest ways new students at Simon's Rock know they are "at college."

An occasional 15-year-old may make it into the higher peer group, but such a person is very rare. I am talking here about easy and natural transition. Of course a great many bright 15-year-olds can do the academic work that is required. But the social stresses and strains introduce the same problem of waste that currently occurs in many careless early admission programs.

At the upper end a different problem arises. If there are not enough 19- or 20-year-olds in a program, those that are will feel the need for their own age group. The clue seems to be that a shift of one year from a peer group will work, but two will not. Thus a 19-year-old can shift from an early college setting to the junior year at a traditional college with little strain; an 18-year-old cannot. The best answer is to keep enough students together in a program up to 19 or 20 if the middle college form is the structure being developed.

What are the signs that the peer group is working effectively? They are all those acts, large and small, that signal acceptance of a person for what he or she is by the rest of the group. There is an absence of "putting-down" of others because of their age. For example, in March of my first year at Simon's Rock, on a balmy day, I looked out the back door at supper time and saw a large group of students playing "red light-green light." My first reaction was—"On a college campus?" Then I looked more closely. There were students from all four classes playing the game. More important, no one went by and acted "cool" by suggesting that the others were children for playing children's games. The next winter a similar thing happened one night after a conversation in a dormitory room about rope-skipping rhymes. By midnight almost all the students were out in the snow in the quad, skipping rope.

One advantage of the early college is that it allows the students to remain young. They are ready for college work; they are ready for college responsibility; but they are also very young in years. They like to costume. They like to play. Thrown into an environment of older students, the characteristic openness and exhuberance is turned off or crushed.

And there is a more serious element. Students in the upper age ranges will still fight for the rights of those in the lower ranges for academic and social freedoms. The closer they get to 21, the more willing they are to see different requirements imposed. A bystander suddenly begins to gain an understanding of college hazing traditions, of the ambiguous position of sophomores, of the shift to upperclass attitudes of juniors in the traditional college. Joining this recognition with a grasp of the unhappy situation of the last two years of high school, one can come to no other conclusion than that the break in our present educational structure is at the wrong age level.

Academic Ability

There is no question of the ability of 16-year-olds to handle college work. All new students at Simon's Rock have taken the GED tests for the past five years and passed them. Indeed, the mean for Simon's Rock students has been the 72nd percentile compared with high school graduates. All entering students also take the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Test. The Simon's Rock mean on that one is the 58th percentile compared with college freshmen. (It is interesting to note that scores on the Watson-Glaser tend to be almost

identical with grades in the science and math classes; there is little correlation with courses in the humanities.) Scores on the CLEP General Examinations, given during the second year, are correspondingly higher than are those of most college sophomores.

As I have said before in relation to such findings as those of the Ford Early Admission Program, there is so much evidence that shows the ability of 16-year-olds to do college-level work that I honestly cannot understand why so many teachers and parents still seem astonished at the idea.

Social Maturity

The results on maturity tests are different. Simon's Rock uses the Loevinger Ego Development instrument and for convenience simplifies the scale to three categories: preconventional, conventional, and postconventional. Although oversimplified, the three categories describe a person who has not yet understood or accepted the rules of conduct of a society or social grouping, one who has accepted those rules and lives with their assumptions even when breaking them, and one who has moved beyond simple acceptance or rejection of societal norms and has the ability to face a situation in its own terms and to work out an individual answer. All students take this test when they arrive and again in their last year. The scores of entering students vary widely from year to year, giving at least one explanation of the variation in what is often referred to as "quality of life" on campus. The most interesting figure is the percentage of those students who are described as "preconventional." During the past five years, this group has varied as follows: 28, 13, 25, 5, 11 percent. The upper figures are those one would normally expect among high school juniors. Yale and New York University freshman classes normally contain about 7 percent preconventional students. As the proportion of students coming directly from tenth grade increases, the number of those scoring as conventional increases, and of those scoring postconventional decreases.

Although no one is quite sure what the figures mean, there are several safe generalizations: the higher the preconventional figure, the more social problems (as indicated by judicial committee cases) exist; there is no correlation between ego development scores and critical thinking measures or demonstrated academic ability; high preconventional percentages indicate that there will be increased classroom problems in developing class discussions and study habits; and, most important of all, anyone who argues

that academic ability is the only basis of judgment for college admission of younger students or that a college does not need to be concerned with the social adjustment of its early admission students is committing a major educational blunder.

One common assumption about this age group needs questioning. Neither the academic nor the social tests indicate a large difference between male and female students. Early physical maturation on the part of the girls does not mean earlier emotional, social, or intellectual maturity. And surprisingly enough, the characteristic of this age group to be terribly aware of and very unsure of their bodies is shared by both sexes.

Admissions

Results of studies of Simon's Rock students must, of course, be taken in context. Admission is selective, but not in the way one might assume. The students are not exceptional students, although there are a number of very bright young people there. Acceptance is based on two standards: academically, a student should be bright normal or better. A short way of stating this is that a B-C student from a good high school tenth grade can make it; a straight C student probably can't. SAT scores are used only as red flags – either if they are very low or if they are very high and not balanced by creditable high school grades. For one thing, no one knows what a tenth grade SAT score ought to be. On the emotional side, an applicant should show signs of maturity. Because Simon's Rock does not have a great many rules (they are basically the college rules of the late 50s or early 60s), it is not equipped to handle what I call positive peer pressure – the practice of students to try to pressure each other into conformity by getting them drunk, etc. Since all dormitory head residents are faculty members, they feel more comfortable acting as role models, advisers, or counselors than as policemen. They are there in supportive roles to help students make their own decisions. The college looks for students who have a sense of their own identity and do not have to copy the behavior of others to discover who they are.

Academic Maturity

Not only are they ready for college level work, but they are able to handle college courses. This is a very important distinction. One of the first questions I had to answer for myself on arriving at Simon's Rock was whether the students could indeed perform at a college

level. Sitting in on courses certainly had convinced me of their ability, but the test of a real class on a weekly basis is something quite different. As a result I taught my courses (Shakespeare, The Age of the Baroque, Greek Culture) as much as possible as I had taught them at places like Colby College, Case-Western Reserve, San Francisco State College, University of Wyoming, or Elmira College. There is no question of the ability of the young Simon's Rock students to handle the work.

There were two elements that were different, however. I am inclined to give very general assignments for theme topics, for example, "Pick a subject that interests you and that is present in at least three of Shakespeare's plays." The students would dutifully write the assignment down, but a week or two later the tension in class would be intense. They wanted to know what I meant. They did not want titles or subjects to be assigned, but they did want some examples. After all, they had come to college from tenth grade.

I told a group of my former college students about this at a later time, and they said, "What makes you think it's any different with students entering college at a later date? It's just that no one dares ask." It was at that point that I came to the conclusion that Simon's Rock isn't doing anything that every other college shouldn't be doing; it's just that at Simon's Rock, because of the age group, we had to do it.

The other different characteristic was the tendency for a time to occur when the class broke down and everyone started acting his or her own young age. There seemed to be no clear or consistent precipitating factor. One just suddenly was faced with a very young group of students. The answer was obviously not to cut them down, but to help work through the situation. Usually by the end of the class, they were back on track, working at full capacity.

A point on which there is some disagreement among Simon's Rock faculty lies with the pace and structure of first year courses. Many believe that it is necessary to begin such a course at a slower pace than the usual freshman course and then pick it up so that by the end of the second semester the same amount of work is covered. There is also a large group that feels that first year courses with students just out of tenth grade require considerably more structure than most college freshman courses.

External Examiners

One reason for the inclusion of the external examiner part of the final year was to assure that not only were the students ready to begin college early but that they had reached the same level of achievement by the end of four years. (The Loevinger tests indicate that growth in emotional maturity paralleled that of traditional college students.) It was important for someone outside the college to be involved in that judgment. All students working for the B.A. in the spring of 1976 passed their thesis and comprehensive exams. It is worth quoting one of the external examiner reports to indicate the success of the program:

Compared with other B.A. students I have worked with (in almost thirty years of teaching), I would rank him in the top 5%. He is learned, endowed with intellectual curiosity but also with a mature sense of perspective, articulate, and poised. He far exceeded the normal expectations I have come to have for a B.A. candidate.

Also, a Harvard faculty member's evaluation of graduating seniors' performance in one major:

While these students were not substantially different from "C" level students at other undergraduate institutions, they do pose an educational challenge to a faculty committed to the development in all students of high level, abstract intellectual capability. To continue to hold such goals for all students, Simon's Rock has set for itself a major educational task and one which goes beyond that attempted by many other universities.

Not only are the younger students capable of high level work, but their enthusiasm, resulting from allowing them to move ahead when they are ready, makes it possible for them to do more than they would traditionally have done.

There is a real springboard effect from letting the 16-year-old move into college work. The achievement not only in the first year of the change is noticeably high, but it continues. That is one explanation of the fact that transfer students do so well at the next college or university. Another part of this springboard effect is the student's ability and desire to do substantive independent work early in his or her college career. It is not surprising that the guided study work of the spring term is seen by students and faculty alike as the most valuable part of the transition year program. One of the constants in the successful programs across the country for younger than normal students doing college work is the necessity for a ma-

jor portion of independent work. It is one of the factors in recognizing and supporting the growing maturity of the 16- or 17-year-old.

One other point needs to be made concerning the ability of students to do college level work. In even the best secondary level work there tends to be a separation of the academic and personal sides of students. At Simon's Rock the students entered into full college work because they knew they were in college and knew they had to apply all their experience to their work. There was no holding back of parts of themselves from the process (for example, I never saw a girl pretend she was less smart in order to get a date or be popular). I have taught a group of brilliant high school seniors for a year without getting them to the college level, no matter how hard I have tried. They were academically serious, perceptive, at times brilliant, but they would not bring their personal lives into an understanding and analysis of the literature they were studying. It is not a factor of age but of context. College is the place where you do that, and college still seems "out there" to them while they are in secondary school. Without such involvement, however, a mature understanding of literature, art, psychology is not possible. Basic scientific information is, which is the reason that there have always been a large number of mathematical "genuises" run through the system quickly. But I would submit that even in science and mathematics there is a difference. For example, a high school student in the sense I have used that category above, is not likely to come to an understanding or appreciation of an "elegant" solution, which should be an essential part of college math.

If anyone objects that the kind of maturity I am describing is missing in most freshman college courses and in many college courses at all levels including graduate school, all I can answer is that Sinclair Lewis is still right and that much of what passes as college work is still really high school.

Another danger in considering how to provide early college work is what I have come to call the good secondary school teacher. Watching such a teacher work with students, one begins to see a pattern that is repeated over and over again. The teacher communicates, usually very subtly, the following message: "1. I love you; 2. You are very bright (mature, capable, sensible . . .); 3. We have shared a great classroom experience together; 4. I am very much brighter and older than you are; 5. If you want this relationship to continue, you'd better remember number 4 and listen to me." A bad secondary school teacher leaves out number 1. Now up to a certain point

this is very supportive and encouraging, but beyond a certain point it is repressive. It holds back the independent development of the student. Any program of early college work must get rid of the high school context where the academic and personal worlds of the student remain separated and of the teacher attitudes which, although caring, do not allow the student a chance to grow on his own and away from the teacher.

Unsolved Problems

Obviously all is not idyllic at Simon's Rock. The fact that a large number of students pursue only the A.A. or choose to transfer early is probably a result of the fact that the proportion of 16-year-olds is greater than it should be. Preconventional behavior can become the norm and one result is attrition among older students who will seek their own age group at traditional colleges.

The college has not grown as quickly as desired. From the very beginning the goal has been to reach 800, but the enrollment has leveled off at about 200. With students now entering purposely to get the B.A. this should change. But in the meantime, almost every difficulty of the college, academic or social, stems from its size. For example, one unhappy student in a suite of six means an unhappy suite; one unhappy suite in a dorm of seven suites means an unhappy dorm; and one unhappy dorm among four means an unhappy week on campus.

The chance situation that led to the decision, in 1970, to have coed dorms produced results that were both good and bad. One of the good results is the opportunity it provides for young men and women to grow up together in an easy and relaxed atmosphere of friendship. At the same time, the natural pressures of the age group result in sexual exploration that creates turmoil for a few students. There is probably no more sexual activity than there is in a closely-watched secondary boarding school (any more than there is more drug use or alcohol); indeed there may be less. But for some students there is not the physical barrier of space that allows for an easy "no" to questions of intimacy. I think everyone at Simon's Rock would agree that the best situation would be to provide a choice between single-sex or coed dorms.

It is probably fair to say that more than 90 percent of the problems at Simon's Rock are social ones. Even the burden of faculty advising comes down to the fact that the faculty find themselves knowing about and having to deal with the personal lives of the stu-

dents as much as with their academic work. In some ways it may be fair to say that the faculty know too much about the students. But this, of course, is also one of the major virtues of the institution.

Advanced Placement and the International Baccalaureate

The remainder of this volume is a kind of working catalogue, description and guidebook of different ways of breaking the traditional articulation of high school and college. It is not intended as an exhaustive study or inventory of all the current programs across the country. Except in one case it does not attack the problem as it first appears in primary school nor does it attempt to deal with the issue of accelerated college work as that is being handled in a number of three-year degree programs.[1] It is an honest attempt to deal with actual programs that can be used as models by other schools and colleges as they try to work out their own solutions to a very real educational problem.

It is definitely not a proposal to promote one answer to the problem of articulation between secondary and postsecondary education. The goal should be flexibility rather than a new unified system. Moreover, I believe that no model is directly transportable. Each institution has to work out its own unique solution, but in the light of others' experiences.

Value judgments and opinions about the programs are my own. In some cases they are based on observations made by the institutions' teachers or students, in others on conclusions that are derived from evaluation studies at Simon's Rock, and some result from personal convictions. Among the latter is a central assumption. I agree with Alfred North Whitehead that any real examination situation should arise out of the specific classroom relationship of a teacher with a group of students. Thus I have a built-in bias against system-wide tests unless they allow for a good deal of individual differentiation in administering and in answering the questions. A good teacher, especially for college level work, should be free from artificial limits in developing a course. A syllabus that is too tight restricts the natural and, I believe, essential relationship between teacher and students that should grow in a classroom.

In each case a three-pronged approach will be used. First I will describe the program briefly, attempting to touch on all its essential features. Second, I will try to sort out its strengths and weaknesses, and finally, I shall attempt an explanation of how another institution might go about beginning a similar program with the least difficulty. All the programs that are still operable would be most willing to share information with other schools and colleges. Readers are reminded of five studies that include examples of new methods of high school-college articulation: from the Carnegie Commission series published by McGraw-Hill, *Less Time–More Op-*

tions, and Ann Heiss' *An Inventory of Academic Innovation and Reform;* from the New York State Education Department, *Linking Schools and Colleges;* from the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Robert M. Bersi's *Restructuring the Baccalaureate;* and from the Curriculum Service Center of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, *Curriculum Report*, Vol. 5, No. 2, "College Courses: A Twelfth Grade Option."

National and International Programs for High Schools

Two programs, the Advanced Placement Program of the College Board, and the International Baccalaureate, are both well known, the latter primarily outside the United States.

The Advanced Placement Program developed from discussions concerning recommendations of the *General Education in the Schools and Colleges Report* in 1951 and 1952. The first AP examinations were given in the spring of 1956. Since then, except for a momentary slackening in 1972-73, the program has grown steadily in size and complexity. In 1956, 1,229 students in 104 schools took 2,199 examinations for use at 130 colleges. Twenty years later, 75,651 students from 3,939 schools took 98,898 examinations, applying to 1,580 colleges and universities. By the spring of 1977, more than 800,000 students will have taken more than 1,000,000 Advanced Placement examinations.

In 1966, 13 examinations were available in the program. Ten years later there were 18. Only two from the 1966 list had been dropped (fifth year Latin and Latin Comedy – both the Virgil and Latin Lyric examinations are still available). The examinations include a wide range of subjects: American History, Art History, Studio Art, Biology, Chemistry, Latin (2 examinations), English, European History, French (2 examinations: Language and Literature), German, Mathematics (2 examinations, both in calculus), Music, Physics (2 examinations), and Spanish.

AP's summary covers the subject nicely:

Advanced Placement serves three groups: students who wish to pursue college-level studies while still in secondary school, schools that desire to offer these students the opportunity to do so, and colleges that wish to encourage and recognize such achievement. It does this by providing practical descriptions of college-level courses to interested schools and the results of examinations based on these courses to the colleges of the students' choice. Participating colleges, in turn, grant credit and appropriate placement, or one of these, to

students who have done well on the examinations. Thus the Advanced Placement Program is an instrument of cooperation that extends the educational opportunities available to students by effectively relating college-level courses at thousands of schools to appropriate credit and placement at the colleges that the students eventually attend.

In each subject the College Board appoints a development committee made up of both college and secondary school teachers who draw up course descriptions and examinations. The course descriptions act as guides to teachers who develop their own courses in the schools or who use the guides as a basis for assigning extra work for students in high school courses that may not, in their present form, cover all the material necessary for passing the examinations, or to students who wish to prepare for the examinations through independent study. Then, in May, the examinations are given in participating schools or at special multischool centers. Most examinations contain both an objective question section and an essay or problem-solving section. In June the examinations are graded by several hundred secondary school and college teachers who are familiar with the program. The examinations are graded on a 5 point basis: (5) Extremely well qualified; (4) Well qualified; (3) Qualified; (2) Possibly qualified: (1) No recommendation. In July the grades are reported back to the schools and students and forwarded to the colleges the students are entering. The cost of the program is borne by the individual students who, this year, pay $32 for each examination they take.

Individual colleges have their own policies concerning how AP grades are credited. The College Board publishes the list of institutions that "normally accept Advanced Placement Examination grades for advanced placement and credit, or one of these," in the fields of each of the exams. They also indicate which accept a grade of 3 (in some cases 2) and which require either a 4 or 5. One of the inequalities of the implementation of the program is that, although validation tests have shown that college students who pass the courses they have taken at college often score 2 or 3 on the exams, many of their colleges require a 4 or 5 from high school students in order for them to gain some form of advanced placement or credit. There is nothing that the Advanced Placement Program can do except note the grade restrictions of the individual colleges.

The amount of freedom given to a teacher depends to a great extent on the course and the examination. For example, in English a teacher has a great deal of freedom in choosing texts and critical

approaches. In French literature on the other hand, a specific list of fifteen works is chosen and changed every two years, and the traditional French method of *explication* is required. But it is important to point out that it is possible in some cases for a student to prepare independently for the exams. For example, one student I know decided to take the English examination, the Art History, and the European History examinations. She simply felt that her various English courses had prepared her sufficiently for that one. For the Art History and European History examinations she put together her background in interdisciplinary courses in Greek culture and the Baroque period, and an English history course (plus some lectures in art history that she had audited). She received two 5s and a 4 and received advanced standing as a sophomore at Radcliffe.

Of course, various teachers react differently to the guidelines for beginning an Advanced Placement course distributed by the College Board. Some feel the need to stick to them very closely, and to construct a syllabus that either follows one of the sample syllabi exactly or uses the suggested texts and readings as the basis for the courses. Others study past exams and build courses that supply the kinds of information and critical aptitudes that will allow students to do well on the exams. Thus the program provides as much or as little outside structure as a good teacher wants. There is always the danger that administrative pressures will force a teacher to follow a suggested syllabus too closely. But introductory courses in the various colleges differ markedly from one another, and thus standardization of AP courses is not likely.

There is the problem, however, of the good secondary school teacher who is fully qualified to teach a college level course and yet is forced to consider the kinds of examinations given by AP in drawing up his course. Many excellent teachers may be kept back from working in the AP structure for this reason. They may have to give up elements of personal choice because of external pressures. At the same time those external pressures are necessary for less qualified teachers. As with other educational issues, this situation is a matter of trade-offs. Considering the scope of the AP program, probably the maximum of individual choice is being allowed at the same time that verifiable standards are being maintained.

Until 1972 there was a real gap in the subject matter of the examinations being offered by AP because there were none in the arts, but in that year the Art History, Studio Art, and Music examinations were added. The number of students involved is still very

small in relation to the number of excellent art and music programs that exist in the secondary schools. In 1976 only 453 students were involved in the Studio Art program and 440 in the Music.

The other gap still present is in the social sciences: psychology, sociology, anthropology, and economics. As these four subjects make up a major part of freshman courses in American colleges, and since more and more high schools are offering one or more courses in these subjects, a new set of examinations is needed. The College Board is understandably reluctant to begin to develop tests in a new field until the number of students wishing the examination becomes large enough to make establishing the various committees, publishing the tests, and so on, financially feasible. Unfortunately, AP has never fully supported itself within the framework of College Board activities, and increasing financial pressures could bring about its demise.

The major drawback of the AP Program lies not with the high schools or the College Board, however. It lies in the lack of clarity concerning credit and placement in colleges. One generalization seems fair: the more competitive the college or university, the more rational and explicit its AP policies are.

Policies range from acceptance for graduation credit of any course with an AP exam grade of 2 or above to no acceptance of any AP grade for either credit or placement. The latter policy is so irrational and academically untenable that it does not deserve notice. What does concern us is the range of greyness that characterizes most college use of AP grades. In one college the range of acceptance may include total credit allowance, partial allowance, or placement only. For example, Skidmore College publishes the following statement:

The College will grant credit toward graduation to those achieving a grade of 4 or 5 on an Advanced Placement Test of the College Entrance Examination Board. Such credit will be accepted to meet a general course distribution requirement and/or as a prerequisite for an advanced course in a given field. A grade of 3 may be given placement or credit at the discretion of the department in the related field of study.

The first sentence is clear. The second becomes hazy and a student would be well advised to inquire what a 4 or 5 would mean in freshman courses. The third sentence means almost nothing without further information. The safest way to interpret the statement is for a student to plan for a full four-year program at Skidmore

unless he or she can get at least three grades of either 4 or 5. A grade of 3 will probably mean that the student will not have to repeat any course taken in high school but also will not get college credit. One good thing about a statement in the college catalogue like this one is that it shows the student what sorts of questions he or she ought to ask. Most students think colleges have consistent policies on AP and do not realize the great variation among different departments on most campuses.

Officials of the AP Program would be overjoyed to be able to clarify advanced standing, credit or placement opportunities among the colleges, but the field is far too murky to permit that – and it is not likely to become any clearer in the next few years. Actually, the more clearly and simply a college can state its position, the more likely it will benefit from the increasing numbers of students taking the examinations. One way of stating AP's difficulty is that its grades and credits are not part of the academic club. The College Board cannot issue a college transcript and thus must accept the interpretations of individual colleges.

Another word of warning is necessary, especially for high school guidance counselors. While students from families with sufficient incomes to handle college tuition may not be particularly concerned about time savings at college and may simply want to get rid of unnecessary duplication, many families are deeply concerned about finances, and $32.00 for a full year course credit is a bargain if it saves some tuition at college, but it is an additional cost to a family that still is facing college costs if it does not save on future tuition. Should a student with marginal financial background be advised to take AP exams? It depends on the college or colleges to which a student is applying, on the number of exams being taken, and on the student's probable grade. Anything less than three AP exams will probably not cut any time off a student's college career. Three exams with grades of 3 will potentially give a student sophomore standing at a place like Harvard (decision made at entrance) or Yale (decision made at end of freshman year), where there are clearly formulated Advanced Standing Programs. (The AP grades are not the determining grades for admission, however, a fact that is commonly misunderstood by applicants.) In a typical college that has a normal student course load of five courses per semester, each counting three credit hours, one or two AP courses with a grade of 4 or 5 will not make a sizable dent in the 120 credit hour graduation requirement; they will not even give a

student second semester freshman standing.

Three AP exams, passed at a level required by the accepting college, could well mean that a student could complete college in three years if during that time he or she takes an overload of one course each for four out of the six semesters remaining. That raises other questions, such as the student's ability to handle overloads.

In sum, AP provides one of the best ways to eliminate a good deal of high school–college duplication of courses and, under the present complicated and diverse methods of college crediting, a somewhat doubtful way to speed up high school–college articulation, requiring great care on the part of students and their families in choosing colleges.

Advanced Standing at Harvard

Three ways of using the Advanced Placement Program deserve individual attention. The use of AP for advanced standing at Harvard began in 1955-56 and has grown slowly but steadily since then. The university makes both the advantages and disadvantages clear to qualifying students, including a warning to parents not to try to force their sons or daughters into the program because of the money to be saved. One result is that only half of those who qualify choose to accept sophomore standing, and a very large percentage continue at Harvard for a fourth year, although often they are working on a master's degree by that time. Out of a typical entering group, about 70 or 80 will leave the program, 80 will complete the program in three years and of those, 20 will go on to graduate work.

It was not always so. Until 1973, most advanced standing students remained for a fourth year. Those who did leave in three years tended to be pre-med students (usually women) who went on to graduate school. The change seems to be partly because of the increased costs of a year in college.

Some of the characteristics of these students are interesting. The average age of the group is below that of regular freshmen. Because of that and because many of the students are, in the words of one administrator, "very fragile," they are housed together with other freshmen in Harvard Yard their first year. They survive, but the early years are sometimes quite difficult. (A younger-than-average student given sophomore standing is, in effect, two years out of his age group.) The mean SAT average for the group is below the mean for all freshmen. Although there is a large percentage of premedical students in the group the number of students who plan to

apply to medical or law school is approximately the same as in the freshman class as a whole.

When the advanced standing program was accepted at Harvard, both the general education faculty and the regular departments "gave" a little to fit the program in. In the early years a good many students took sophomore standing to get rid of some of their general education requirements and then stayed four years, thus creating a *de facto* major curriculum reform. The general education faculty fought back by claiming its requirements into the third year. This has settled down to a situation in which students in the program must use the accelerated schedule or be loaded with the full college requirements. It now means that an advanced standing student must fulfill the requirements to graduate without honors by the end of the third year, but may stay a fourth year to complete a thesis if a candidate for honors.

The Harvard faculty by no means supports the program unanimously. Early on, the recognition that returning Korean veterans were older than other freshmen students contributed to acceptance, but by the time the program got going, that situation was almost over and the faculty changed its emphasis from acceleration to flexibility. There is no doubt that support for advanced standing varies from department to department. Students I talked to felt severe pressures in some departmental offices, where the faculty argued that the students simply couldn't complete the material in the field of concentration in three years, although faculty in a number of the science departments are in favor of the program because they feel the fourth year should be used for graduate work. It would be useful for a student who wants to accelerate at Harvard to inquire ahead of time about faculty attitudes.

Roy High School – Weber State College

A variation on the 3-3 program that adds a substantial educational element is the program at Roy High School, Roy, Utah. The school describes to its students which colleges will give sophomore standing to students who score 3 or better on three AP exams. There is also a special arrangement with Weber State College in nearby Ogden, Utah. Three courses for the students under this plan are considered a full load, although students may register for other high school courses on an audit basis. If a student prefers to take a Weber State course different from the AP offerings, he may do so. These three courses, if passed with a grade of 3 or better, are given

45 quarter hours of credit by Weber State. Besides taking the coursework, each student does an independent study project in cooperation with both a high school and a college teacher. For this project the student can earn from one to six quarter hours of college credit from Weber State.

The value of this approach is obvious. It adds the independent study element that seems to be so important in a successful program of early college work and it brings the student into a close working relationship with both high school and college faculties. Perhaps equally important, it brings the two faculty groups together.[2]

Calasanctius School

The third use of AP, that of an evaluation tool for a totally integrated, self-generated academic program, is found at a unique school in Buffalo, New York, the Calasanctius School. Started as a preparatory school for boys in 1957 by Father Stephen Gerencser, the nonresidential school, now coeducational, is designed for "the academically talented." In general, children must show a 130 I.Q. on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale to be admitted. Although there are a number of faculty of the Piarist Order, including the current Headmaster, Father Bela Krigler, it is not a Roman Catholic school. Students do take religion courses, but these are developed on various denominational lines.

The initial concept was a five or six year sequence for students who had finished the fourth or fifth grade. As time passed, parents requested a lower school that would take care of children through the fourth grade. Currently, there are approximately 90 students in the lower school, aged 5 to 10; 90 in the middle school, aged 10-13; and 80 in the upper school. The average graduation age is 16 1/2. Entrance to the middle school is determined by I.Q. test, a visual imagination test, an essay on how the student views his or her future, and an interview. Students may enter in the upper years, but they must make up the work they have not had to that time, and a special program for this exists.

For the 260 students there are 24 full-time faculty members, between 15 and 20 part-time faculty and 40 proctors for a seminar program. The tuition is $2,000 for the younger students, $2,250 for the top forms. The sum includes the required field trips but not textbooks. Scholarship aid is taken from the priests' salaries. This year it amounted to $78,000.

The six-year program of the upper two schools is a carefully developed schema in which inside and outside class activities are balanced. The school recognizes that the program is heavily intellectual and is trying to counterbalance this emphasis with required electives in the arts in each of the six years as well as required music and studio art in the first two years. Mathematics is used as the link between the humanities and sciences. The six year sequence in the history of civilization is interdisciplinary in nature and "is directed toward understanding, rather than judging, the various forms of human civilizations." There is a strong English language and literature sequence and also a remarkably wide-ranging foreign language program. In the last four years there is a series of integrating courses labeled "Phenomenon of Man." These include all the social sciences as well as philosophy and religion courses.

A word should be added about the religion courses. There is no religious education for the lower school except in special cases. Grades five and six have denominational meetings (I should point out here that some of the strongest support for the school came from students I talked with who were Jewish). In seventh grade the Bible is taught as literature and as a cultural and historical document. That same year students take a course in developmental psychology. It is in that course and the "Phenomenon of Man" sequence that sex, moral questions, and so on are considered. In the junior year students take one of four systematic theology courses: Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, or 20th Century Theory. In the senior year they take courses in philosophy of religion and history of comparative religions. The stated principles of the school include the following:

- To have convictions based upon solid knowledge and insight, without intolerance and fanaticism.
- To aspire to be responsible men and women in an age of creeping infantilism.
- To have our internal sources and deep enthusiasm shine through, even in the dark nights of struggle and crises which we may experience in our life.

Unique Elements of the Program

There are three parts of the program that receive special attention and are seen as essential as well as unique. The "Phenomenon of Man" sequence is one. The course in developmental psychology at

age 13, discussing such matters as sex and sibling rivalry, appears to be very effective. This sequence becomes heavier each of the last three years. There are nine subjects in the sequence during the senior year and each student takes them all. During the last few weeks of that year, some students spend as many as 10 periods a week in this sequence. (Courses are scheduled as in college: two or three times a week rather than every day. However, students take seven or eight courses and spend nearly 36 periods a week in class.)

Each year all classes participate in a field study trip related to their academic work for two or three weeks. The younger students stay around the Great Lakes or Middle Atlantic states. Then the trips become slightly more exotic, with biology trips to Florida, or anthropological and historical trips to the Mountain or Plains states. The senior trip is a cultural trip to Montreal or New York. These are not high cost, tourist trips. They are hard-working, rough living trips that both students and faculty agree give special focus to each year.

The roughest program, and probably most valuable, is the seminar program. Forty people from the community help out as proctors in this program without pay. Each student must complete satisfactorily two seminar projects. Each student chooses a subject on which he wishes to conduct an in-depth study; a proctor is found from the community or from the faculty to work with the student on a one hour a week basis. The subjects range from computer programs and "The Design and Construction of a Solid State Doppler Radar with Digital Readout" to a study of "Carolingian Political Thought in the Reign of Louis the Pious." This independent work occupies 5 to 10 hours weekly in the fourth year and 8 to 15 hours a week for the last two years. When the seminar paper is completed, a panel of faculty members and the proctor read it and put the student through an oral defense of approximately an hour. This examination is described by everyone involved as "ruthless."

By the age of 16 a student at Calasanctius School can safely be described as ready for any academic program that is currently being offered in the United States. It is at this point that the AP program enters in. A student needs to have 800 honors points for graduation. First, nine points must be earned by AP exams. Thus a 5 and a 4 grade would be sufficient, as would three 3s; 2s are not accepted. These basic points are then multiplied by 10 (i.e., an AP 5 gives you 50 honors points). Then each course grade (based on a 5 point system) is multiplied by the credit hours of the course. Fi-

nally the grades on the seminar papers are multiplied by ten for the fourth year, 13 for the fifth year and 16 for the sixth year. This places heavy weight on the independent research program. The school also can award a state diploma for students who have earned 350 honor points.

As far as articulation is concerned, a student at Calasanctius School can graduate at 16, two years ahead of his peer group at traditional secondary schools, with a superb education and at least three AP exams, meaning that he could gain sophomore standing at a college with an AP advanced standing program.

Advantages and Problems

There are, of course, some problems. They are not, however, ones that one might at first expect. Here is no group of abnormal grinds, wandering quietly from class to class, lost in their books. They are as happy, verbal, outgoing a group of students as any I met in visiting schools for this study. Moreover they tend to deny their own special abilities, and perhaps rightly so. As one girl said, "Don't let them fool you. We're no brighter than most kids. I've just recently come here from a public school in Ohio, and it's not so different or so much more difficult." The truth, as usual, probably lies somewhere in the middle. They did not strike me as much different from many entering Simon's Rock students, but they were also certainly not an average city high school group. They are demonstrably bright, as their I.Q. scores indicate, but even more important, they are continually kept working at their highest levels. There is no question of the importance of the independent study work of the final three years in maintaining enthusiasm and performance levels.

But 50 percent of those who enter the program drop out. Some simply don't make it academically. Last year six were dropped for academic reasons. A good many drop out because of the tuition, probably the greatest single reason for attrition. More conservative Roman Catholics withdraw their children because of the lack of rules and failure to stress strict moral systems. Younger boys tend to drop out because the girls dominate, and yet the girls, who make up about 42 percent of the student body, seem to have more social problems than the boys do.

The students themselves do not see any social problems. None of the ones I talked with felt that their social life depended on the school. Calasanctius is a day school, and the students have most of

81

their social life in their home neighborhoods. There are not many school social events. The students organize an occasional dance, help wait on tables at the gourmet meals for which the school is famous, take part in athletics, but most of their friends are their friends at home, at church, in their local neighborhoods. They acknowledge that the fact that they go to Calasanctius is sometimes a source for jokes against them and some hard times result, but it does not seem to be much of a problem. Such jokes always contain a large element of envy, and these students are bright enough to know it.

Inside the school there does not seem to be any problem of mixing the various ages. The younger students are obviously very much at home and not cowed by the presence of the juniors and seniors. But of course the juniors and seniors are only 14, 15 and just 16. The lack of rules extends throughout the school, and no one sees any serious problems with this. There are no conduct grades, nor will the school make any personal statements about the students. Father Gerencser's position is that colleges should not know about the applicants as individual persons, that the principle of educating the whole man is nonsense. The only report the school makes is about what the student knows.

I would suggest that such a view means that certain kinds of evidence and events simply are not paid attention to. For example, the school used to have a residence hall, but not any longer. It may be, as stated, that the residence hall was too expensive. But it is also true that in the latter half of the 60s drugs were a very real problem at the school and drug use in the residence halls could not be controlled – the result was several very bad incidents of overdoses. It was at that point, eight years ago, that the residence hall was closed – also just before the school became coeducational. There are some students (about 10) who do not come from Buffalo, but they live in selected private homes in the area.

There is one obvious reason for the small number of overt social problems: no one has any time. Student schedules are jammed during the 36 class periods of the week, and in addition each upper form student is expected to do 26 hours of homework. Students interviewed felt that that number was on the low side of the actual number of hours they spent, especially when working on seminar papers.

I found one statement about the schedule fascinating. Only five minutes are allowed between classes (which run from 8:40 to 3:35 with a 20 minute lunch period, a 20 minute play break, and three

gym periods a week). The reason for the short break is that it was found that if students were given ten minutes, the faculty had difficulty in getting them back to work.

This academic pressure boiler certainly avoids social problems of the more obvious kind, but it is probable that only students with high I.Q.s and fast learning rates can keep up. Rather than trying to find out whether the same results can be achieved with less pressure, the school has tended to leave the program alone and try to deal with the extra-academic sources of problems by eliminating them. Getting rid of the residence hall is one example. Perhaps one potential program that is not being implemented is an even better example.

All teachers agree on one statement: that the best way to learn is to teach. But no educational system I am aware of uses that concept as a central approach. Even where there are built-in opportunities for students to teach, faculties seldom encourage it. One of the great benefits of the volunteer tutoring services started by high school and college students during the 60s was the opportunity it gave to those students to learn by teaching. Calasanctius has an almost unequaled opportunity to give their upper form students a chance to further their own education by teaching in the lower or even in the middle school. These students have been through the program, know both the material and the goals, are bright, verbal, and outgoing. As a matter of fact, they want to do such teaching very badly. And some of them do – but only if they have some free time. Although they are given credit for teaching or tutoring, there is no move to create gaps in the structure of classes to open the opportunity to a wider group of students or even to those who indicate they would like it. But, unquestionably, it would help the students' maturing process.

Maturity

The question of maturity is a very real one both to the administration and many of the students. Father Gerencser is not worried about the age at which the students move on to college and says that the students in the first classes had no emotional problems in going on to college or university. (It goes without saying that almost 100 percent of Calasanctius graduates go to college and most go on to graduate school.) Whether the fact that only about 10 percent return to Buffalo after college is an indicator of any kind is hard to judge. Father Gerencser maintains that social problems in

college depend on the individual, not on age. However, this is not supported by other studies. Father Gerencser also feels that the 50 percent of Calasanctius students who go to "good colleges" meet a large group of students who are also young, but he admits that those who go to less good or less competitive colleges may have more trouble. Father Krigler tends to agree with the idea that the students have not had many problems because of the nature of their preparation. They have real advantages. They know how to write papers and often have a number of friends in their first year in college because they can help others by advising on how to write papers, take exams, and so on. But he admits that they do not dare to let on how young they are. Calasanctius is able to keep relatively good track of its graduates because of two "Headmaster's Teas" each year to which they return. There are also 5- and 10-year parties for the senior classes at graduation and an alumnus speaker.

But Father Krigler admits there is a need for greater maturity in the graduates. For one thing, since they all go to college, SAT scores are important, and the students need extra time for bettering their performance on the tests. As a result, there is now both an additional year – a seventh year – for those who wish to stay, and a special year between the middle and upper schools for those who wish to relax a bit, to slow down (except in math) until they reach puberty. Sixteen students are currently in that program and will be a year older (14) when they enter the fourth form. Most of the students I talked to were going to stay for the extra final year and felt that extra time and being older were important for college entrance. They were counting on their AP scores to let them out of courses at college that would be repetitious. No one was concerned about keeping up the acceleration that Calasanctius made possible.

Faculty

There are also problems among the faculty. There used to be a general meeting of the "Phenomenon of Man" sequence to maintain a unifying thread to the various courses, but faculty have opted out of that on disciplinary lines. Now there is an exam in which each student picks a topic that brings the material together. The faculty load is heavy: 25 classroom hours a week plus five nonclassroom supervisory periods. A union struggle has split the faculty down the middle. And there are the usual problems of tenure, resistance to change, and all the other stresses common to most educational institutions.

In spite of the small size of the institution, there is as little social life among the faculty as among the students. The union has a cultural meeting each year, the parent-teacher meetings are largely social, and each of the schools meets once a month, with a social side to those meetings.

International Baccalaureate

Closely akin to the AP Program is the International Baccalaureate, an international program having a two-year structure of courses and an international set of exams. It differs from AP principally in that the International Baccalaureate prescribes the structure of a participant's curriculum as well as requiring the mastery of certain approaches in each of the courses to be examined. Another difference is that there are two levels of examinations and courses – the subsidiary level roughly equates with the English "O" level exams and the higher level roughly equates with "A" level.

The history of the development of IB not only reveals its *raison d'etre*, but also shows the strongest argument for its acceptance, either as a mode of teaching at a secondary school or as a basis for advanced standing at a college.[3]

Early in the 1960s, 195 schools founded the International Schools' Association to study ways to harmonize both curriculums and methods of teaching. The schools were primarily concerned with three university-bound groups: students living abroad, native students returning from abroad, and students likely to go abroad for university. There was no international "currency" in university entrance requirements that met the varying standards and tests given in different countries. In 1963 the Twentieth Century Fund gave the ISA a three-year grant to establish machinery for a common curriculum. In 1965 the International Schools' Examination Syndicate, which later became IB, was established, and the first conference to consider the structure of the program was held. In 1967, at a conference at Sevres, the IB was officially established.

The first full set of examinations was offered in May 1970, and the program has grown slowly but steadily since then. There are still only three secondary schools in the United States involved, but there will be four when the Washington International School expands as far as the twelfth grade. There are also two junior colleges (Rockland Community College, N.Y., and Mercer County Community College, N.J.) that use the program, offering the IB diploma along with the A.A. at the end of two years, especially to high

school seniors who enter those institutions during their senior year. Six secondary schools in Canada use IB. Altogether, there are more than 40 schools in 20 countries with functioning programs.

The IB structure is very clear and purposely traditional. A student takes six subjects, three at a subsidiary level and three at a higher level: (1) language A (a student's own language); (2) language B (a second language); (3) the "Study of Man" (there are six options: history, geography, economics, philosophy, psychology and social anthropology); (4) Experimental Science (five options: physics, chemistry, biology, physical science, scientific studies); (5) mathematics; (6) a sixth subject, either plastic arts, music, a classical language, a second language B, another option from either 3 or 4, or additional mathematics. A school may offer another option under 6, but the process is remarkably complicated, involving the development of a curriculum, the submission of a description of it to the Geneva office, tentative acceptance from IB's panel of experts, a year's testing of the program without credit, and then final acceptance.

All students also take a course called Theory of Knowledge that occupies between 50 and 100 teaching hours during a two-year period but, unlike the other courses, is examined locally. Although there is a nine point description of the course, with examples, each school works out its own procedures, and apparently it is often the least successful course, even though its importance is central to the program.

In addition to all this, each student spends one afternoon a week in some form of creative or aesthetic experience.

Examinations are drawn up by international panels. They are all sent to Geneva for grading, including a cassette of the 30 minute oral part of the higher examinations. The higher examinations last four hours and vary from one four-hour essay to two two-hour essays or a combination of essays and multiple choice questions. Sometimes, as in history and literature, an extended essay is also required. Grades range from 1 (very poor) to 7 (excellent). Four is considered satisfactory and at least a 4 must be achieved in each of the six examinations submitted for the diploma. Individual course certificates can be gained by students who do not earn the full diploma. The cost per student is $10 for each subsidiary level and $15 for each higher level examination.

Cost is a central problem for IB and has slowed the growth of the program. It costs an institution $4,000 a year to offer the IB. This

does not include individual student payments. No boarding school in the United States has yet joined, and cost is a major factor. Calasanctius School freely admits that the cost kept it from joining in the early days; now there are also academic considerations.

The value for many schools is immediately apparent. It provides a set curriculum that has international status, is high in quality, and has an externally verifiable set of standards and evaluations. In an unprepared school, offering the IB will require considerable upgrading. In an AP school very little change is necessary. The difference is that IB offers a full curriculum rather than just a set of courses. The real motivation for instituting IB is the presence of a foreign population or a group of students who would like to consider universities outside the United States.

As far as advanced standing at colleges in the U.S. is concerned, IB is judged (where it is known, and that's the catch) on a level with AP. IB publishes a list of the colleges that have accepted IB exams for credit or placement and it reads like a short list of most of the better ones on the AP list. The same discrepancies in granting credit for AP examinations hold true for IB, only more so, because of the lack of knowledge by people in American colleges and universities. Even statements like that of the New York Board of Regents in March 1976, recommending that schools and colleges within the state make the IB curriculum more widely available, have not had much effect.

The Regents recommended that the IB program be accepted as the equivalent of two years of college, and there is much to be said for that position. I first became acquainted with IB when a representative from the International School of Geneva visited Simon's Rock in 1972. It seemed to me then, and it seems to me now, that IB does not claim enough for itself. It has tacitly agreed to the equation of IB higher examinations with AP, and on an individual course basis that is probably accurate. But IB offers a great deal more: a full two-year program covering the traditional liberal arts in a well thought out plan of course offerings, blending regular courses, independent study, and creative projects. If colleges accept any accredited A.A. degree as a basis for junior standing, there is little educational or academic reason to deny that standing to an IB graduate. There is the remaining problem of the youthfulness of IB students, but that is not an academic reason. Unfortunately, the same international base that insures the quality of the examinations robs the program of the accepted full currency that is awarded far less rigorous courses from American colleges because the latter appear

on American college transcripts. I must say that I do not foresee any real change in the situation until more American schools adopt the program, and I do not think that will happen until acceptance is more widespread. It is the old vicious circle once again. None of the colleges on the IB list give more than one year of transfer credit for IB.

Another problem is the discrepancy between American and European university systems. An IB diploma leads to acceptance into a three-year university baccalaureate program in Europe. The argument, therefore, goes that it should not be credited for more than one year in America. But the European university curriculum is a fully specialized program, whereas most American colleges still regard the first two years as consisting of general education and liberal arts courses and those necessary to satisfy distribution requirements, with specialization really taking place in the final two years. If the IB program is regarded as covering the coursework for general distribution, it will equate with the first two years in most American colleges. Anyone who doubts that college standards are being met should look at the course descriptions and the sample examinations available from the IB office.

United Nations International School (UNIS)

Two schools in the New York area illustrate slightly different approaches to the use of IB.

The United Nations International School in Manhattan has a student body that makes the use of IB a natural choice. The school includes kindergarten through twelfth grade students; the IB program starts in the eleventh grade. Some students accelerate by skipping a grade in the "Middle House" (grades 6 to 8) but some faculty members believe this is not a good practice because students are too young to mix with the older students in the upper years. There are very few students who leave for college early, and one of the reasons is that the IB program is keeping them on "campus." Advanced standing or placement is high, and, as in the case of AP, the more selective the college, the more automatic the acceptance of IB credit. One guidance counselor believes that IB now receives readier acceptance than AP.

UNIS is, in some ways, nonselective. Children of any U.N. member are eligible. Non-U.N. children are accepted selectively. Forty percent of the students are non-U.N. members and 30 percent are not international students. Only about 40 percent of the eleventh

and twelfth grade students are IB candidates. Students enter in all classes, mostly at eleventh grade. Of the present 114 seniors, 30 entered in the junior year. One interesting point is that students entering from other IB schools do not necessarily mesh with the UNIS program, which is an indication of the individuality of school programs possible under IB. Nor do students have to choose between IB courses and others. They can take combinations of IB and other courses, although most junior and senior courses are IB.

There is an acknowledged tension for some faculty between the way they wish to teach a course and the IB syllabus, but the students see the syllabus as a gain. The greatest strain is, predictably, in English. Individual courses can be adapted to the program, however. Teachers can write to the examiner and discuss problems, and that appears to be a very helpful process. Simultaneous course evaluations and IB grades are given to students, linking the local judgment with the international. The correlation between the two grades is very close. Teachers also send to the examiner in each course an evaluation of the continuing progress of each student based on an anticipated grade on the examination. The teacher also states his or her own grade for the student at that time.

One indication that the general context of the school is still that of a secondary school is the fact that a real "Senior Slump" occurs after college applications are filed. Although this is understandable, it means the program has not really convinced students that they are already fully involved in college work. The independent study (for the extended essays) part of the program is seen as crucial to the developing maturity of the students. The Theory of Knowledge course should be but isn't, probably because the priority given to it by the faculty is low. Little preparation is done for it. At UNIS another part of the program is a strong social service component, required of all students, and considered by everyone to contribute significantly to the students' maturing process.

There is no doubt that IB's greatest strength as implemented at UNIS, is that it is a complete educational package. It focuses the education of the students in a way that mere elective courses do not. That unity becomes immediately apparent in the lounges of the Upper House, in the discussions overheard in the hall, in talking with students. As an increasingly larger proportion of the student body undertakes the whole program, that effect should grow. But UNIS does have a very special situation that is in favor of the program: the international mix of faculty and students in a metro-

politan center like New York creates an educational climate different from that of most schools.

Francis Lewis High School

About fifteen miles east of the United Nations, a very different kind of school is preparing students for their first encounter with the IB examinations. Francis Lewis High School in Flushing, New York, with a population of 3,300, at first seems an unlikely school to offer the International Baccalaureate. To a visitor unaccustomed to the ways of present-day urban high schools, the obstacle course of guards, "walkie-talkies" for checking visitors in and out, and so on, all seem unusual accompaniments to a program offering college work to high school juniors and seniors. But a conversation with the school's principal soon sets all that straight. Actually, there are three college credit programs being offered simultaneously, and they often overlap. Four courses are given for Adelphi credit (Probability and Statistics, Bible in Western Literature, Western Civilization, and Psychology), four AP courses (English, Calculus, American History, and Biology), and the IB program, that has just begun and will not graduate its first seniors until the summer of 1978. All the AP courses will also work for IB. Students can take them for either program or simply for high school credit. Of the present graduating class of 800, 150 students take at least one of the college level courses. Twenty-eight juniors are fully involved in IB and the school expects 20 of those to graduate with the diploma. One of the complications in the first stage of implementing the program resulted from the fact that the selection process was too inclusive because of competition for students with the other college credit programs. Now the school intends to make IB the center of its acceleration program.

The reason for starting the various programs was the usual one—attrition before and during the senior year. The school used to graduate about 300 students every January; that is now down to 120 graduates. Part of the reason for the change is the poor job market, but the greater part is a result of the new programs.

The school is confident of its ability to run IB successfully because of the faculty's previous experience. When I asked about the independent study aspect of the program, the principal pointed to the school's excellent record in national competition in science fairs and student research. In history, two of the older teachers who will be involved had already developed an independent study section in

the AP Program. The faculty recognize the problem of the Theory of Knowledge course, scheduled to begin next year. It will be run as a seminar, the whole group of IB students and faculty members attending, and outside experts on the various topics will be brought in. It may not work, but the students will know how important the course is to the program and how committed the faculty and administration are to trying to make it work.

The clue to the successful beginning of the program is easy to identify. It took an administrator who was prepared to fight for community support for a high level educational program that was going to cost money and require a lot of local support. A principal's ability to persuade his school board to spend $2,000 a year in the initial stage and then $4,000 a year from then on to support an externally-directed program of an educationally elite nature is, at least, unusual.

Advanced Placement Planning

Although we will consider the AP Program again in reference to high schools where a number of different college study options are offered, it is well at this point to consider the potential uses of AP in high schools generally or as the basis of advanced standing in college. Too often both schools and colleges undertake programs such as AP piecemeal and then wonder why students underutilize them.

From the secondary school point of view the important question is whether or not the school wishes to use AP as a way of allowing a student to accelerate or simply to heighten the level of senior courses and give students a chance to reduce duplication in college. At an early stage of the planning, guidance personnel should conduct a careful study of colleges to which graduates of the school go. Do they give AP credit or placement in higher level courses? Is the policy college-wide or is it at the discretion of each department? What scores are necessary for the award of college credit? The school should try to secure from the colleges as much information, in writing, as possible. Some colleges have not yet had enough pressure put on them. As student enrollments decline, high school guidance counselors and school administrators are in a better position to insist on clarity and reasonable policies.

At the same time, the schools should be open to suggestions from the colleges for programs in early admissions. In the past, this is where agreements broke down. The schools have every right to ask

hard questions about a college's early admission program and to keep it under surveillance. Is the college paying attention to the younger student and supplying support services? We shall return to these questions later.

In planning which and how many AP courses to offer, there have to be some very hard-headed judgments made about faculty qualifications to teach college level material. It would be better not to enter the program than to end up with ill-prepared students. The more courses that can be on the AP level, the better. But there must be a way to record grades in a dual manner so that noncollege bound students will not be penalized.

Pretesting with old examinations may supply a clue to the level of performance that can reasonably be expected. It may well be that a school will choose, as in Utah, to limit the number of AP courses a student may take. Three seems a bit chancy for students who might not do well; five seems too many if the courses are really demanding. Some AP examinations, French Literature, for example, are perhaps best taken after two years' work. But everyone concerned – faculty, students and parents – should realize that at least three courses would be needed for acceleration.

The faculty should have a sense of the entire program rather than simply their own courses. Not only is this important as they consider the work they assign, but also as they see possible relationships with other courses that may be helpful to the students. The more relatedness a student sees, the better he will do in all his courses. So far, AP has not developed an interdisciplinary studies examination of any kind. This is unfortunate because its educational value would be great.

AP does not require independent study, but there is no question of its importance for the accelerating student. Perhaps it is best to use the term guided study. The student needs a tutor or proctor who is willing to spend time on a regular, weekly basis in guiding, questioning, and checking on the student's progress. But the choice of subject should be the student's, and the ultimate responsibility and final form should be the student's as well. In addition, the experience a project of this type provides will prove valuable in taking most AP examinations.

While the administration is, of course, responsible for assuring the quality and integrity of the program, its members should support the faculty in ways that make teachers feel they are free to experiment, to try new ideas and approaches. If AP becomes a se-

ries of predigested syllabi, it will not be a satisfactory substitute for a year of college. It may well become as boring as today's senior year of high school. Testing student performance on AP Examinations in classes that do not appear at first to be AP courses may well provide surprisingly good results. Not only should faculty members be encouraged to participate in the AP grading sessions when invited, but it should be made convenient for them to attend meetings where they can discuss mutual interests with members of college faculties.

Administrators also have an important task in communicating with parents and the whole school community, whether that is a local community or the alumni and friends of an educational institution. The wall of silence that surrounds even a program as old as AP must be broken down. For one thing, parents have to see the value in paying the examination fees for their children. But equally important, they must be convinced that those children are doing college work. If they are not, the children may well not be, either. And unless the students open themselves to the material of the courses, the classroom discussions, and the work on the papers they write, they will not, in most cases, be doing college level work. But for them to open up, they must be convinced that they are doing college work, and they have to get that idea from all sides. Many parents will not be overjoyed at the kinds of books their children will be reading or the openness of their inquiry and mental questioning. They will not be ready for their children's lives to be involved in their learning. The school must support the students in all of this. That is why, if the group of students in a school who are taking AP courses is comparatively small, opportunities must be provided for the students to see themselves as a group. There are dangers in this; there is no doubt about it. But it is necessary, and the school must find ways of countering the social splintering that may occur. It is for this reason that I recommend that a school's AP Program be as large as possible.

The main problem will not develop the first year, when many students will exceed expectations. The second year in any new program is the rough one. And after the third year, new efforts must be made to keep it vital.

It should be stressed that not everyone in an AP course need be AP level or be expected to take the examination. One of the great mistakes of many educational programs is to seek a homogeneous group. The presence of followers spurs the leaders on and provides

them with peer teaching possibilities. What is needed is not uniformity, but clarity and honesty—and a high level of expectation that will pull students at this crucial age of their development to greater performance than they have shown previously.

Advanced Standing

Before discussing ways of establishing an advanced standing program at a college, we should consider the matter of giving credit for AP Examinations. If, as I have tried to show, high school programs like AP are going to increase even more rapidly than in the past, colleges are going to have to be reasonable in their awarding of credit in order to be competitive in attracting students. Let us consider a family in which the daughter has invested a great deal of energy in three AP courses, and the father knows that in May he is going to put down $100 for three examinations. The girl applies to six colleges: one says that no credit will be given for the examinations but maybe the girl will not have to take one or two courses depending on how the departments decide; a second says that no credit will be given, but the girl will not have to repeat anything. A third says that there will be some graduation credit, depending on the department involved, but that in no case will she have to repeat a course; a fourth says that the girl will receive three full-year course credits and will be enrolled as a second semester freshman; a fifth says that she will not have to repeat any of the courses and at the end of the first year her record will be studied by a committee that will then consider giving her junior standing; the sixth says that if she gets 3s in each of her three examinations, she will enter as a sophomore.

Now we add the strange anomaly of American education. Since the girl is bright and upwardly mobile but comes from a relatively small, somewhat rural area, she covers herself carefully and applies to a small local college, a somewhat prestigious (regionally) coeducational college within a hundred miles, Skidmore, her state university, Yale, and Harvard. The chances are that the responses will line up in that order. This family is lucky: because it has been aggressive, it sees that the more selective the college, the better the response to AP.

Last year colleges all over the country reported increased numbers of applications; many middle level colleges (as far as prestige and competitiveness is concerned), reported markedly increased numbers. Yet national enrollments dropped nearly one percent. We

are quickly approaching the time when the enrollment drops will be 15 percent a year and colleges will be closing at the rate of one a week. (That is the red flag method of counting; but it takes very little mathematical ability to take projections of 10 percent of American colleges closing during a four- or five-year period and divide by 52 weeks per year.)

When Harvard accepts a grade of 3 on an AP test as being the equivalent of a freshman pass, the false snobbery of colleges that either require 4s or 5s or give no credit at all will soon be known. Today students apply to a number of colleges, not because they are afraid they will not be accepted, but because they have real choices. Yield rates are dropping even at prestigious schools, and students on waiting lists now have a real chance of being accepted. Colleges will have to adopt reasonable and liberal policies of accepting college work done in high school. Many colleges will begin working closely with individual secondary schools to develop new articulation procedures. But every college should begin now to examine a structure for Advanced Placement using at least the AP grades and their equivalent (IB) as a basis.

Any college should begin planning for an advanced standing program with an all-college committee. Whatever the policy is to be, it must be as clear and precise as possible, if not for purely rational reasons (unfortunately that is no longer a tautology), at least to avoid consumer protection suits. The best advanced standing program is one that is commion to all departments in a college or university. Unfortunately that still, after more than 20 years, means a program for educating the faculty. Information concerning the validity of AP Examinations can be had from either the College Board or the Educational Testing Service in Princeton. Departments or divisions that have doubts should be talked into giving AP Examinations to students who are taking similar courses at their colleges. Planning committees will frequently have real problems, but the ground work is essential. Admissions personnel must be used to convince those who do not recognize the reality of the current situation.

I am not suggesting that standards be lowered – just the opposite. Visits to AP classes in high school should help put some doubts to rest. Moreover, there is reason for some colleges to set a slightly higher grade requirement for advanced standing students than for regular entrants. The accelerating students will be younger than their classmates if they are given sophomore standing, and should

be academically very sound. Thus, if students at a college who have passed a course only do 2 work on an AP Examination, it does not necessarily mean that a secondary school student with a 2 should be given advanced standing. (However, it probably does mean that they should not have to repeat a nearly identical course.)

"And/or" designations of credit should be avoided wherever possible. Where they are used, students and guidance counselors should have an easy way of discovering which is the case for any examination or any grade. This might be done by making the appropriate entry under department course offerings in the college catalogue, but it would be a lot simpler for all concerned if the information could all be in one place. A special brochure would not only be helpful but would provide a good piece of recruiting material to be sent to students or attached to the catalogue sent to guidance offices of secondary schools. The Harvard advanced standing brochure, available from the director of that program, would be a good model for other colleges to study.

It is still true that most colleges do not know how well their programs work for individuals or groups of students. A college that has any real doubts about its policy should keep track of its advanced standing students for at least as long as it takes two classes to graduate. Moreover, such a study should include more than just academic records. It should keep an eye on adjustment problems, counseling and advising needs, and all the other related factors. Changes should not be made in a program unless evidence of a problem is overwhelming. Many faculties do not give a new program a chance to prove itself. They keep changing it so often that they are unable to find what the real problems and the real strengths are.

It is my very strong belief, based on a considerable amount of experience and research, that an advanced standing program should not be considered simply in academic terms. Not only will the students be younger than the sophomores they will be working with in at least some of their classes, but there will be an increasing number of even younger students, those who are 16 or 17. Colleges that show they are aware of the problems of adolescence will not only do a better job in educating them but will be in a stronger recruiting position in relation to parents who question the value of sending off their sons and daughters to college so early. At the least this requires a thorough and thoughtfully developed orientation period, either during the summer or at the beginning of

the school year and the assignment of faculty advisers who are willing and able to help with the problems of social and academic adjustment by the students. Meetings of the students in the program or at least in an office where they can get to know each other are valuable in counteracting the almost inevitable feelings of loneliness that many of the students feel unless or until there is a large enough group on campus with which they can identify. Questions of housing (such as the decision at Harvard to house this group in the Yard) and of social regulations should be faced early and realistically. To accept these students on a simple sink or swim basis is either unethical or possibly immoral, as it is with all cases of early admission.

Unlike some early admissions situations, however, there is no reason for a readjustment of academic programs or processes or of SAT requirements for admission. These students should have been accepted on the basis of having already completed much or all of the freshman year college requirements. They should, and probably will, perform at a higher level than other students at the college.

Restructuring Primary and Secondary Education

It is not the purpose of this book to suggest ways to restructure the whole educational establishment from kindergarten through graduate school, tempting as that might be. For example, there seem to be natural breaks that could be used to keep peer groups together while allowing individual students to move at their own speed, inserting years where a plateau is evidently reached during which students would gain most by acting as assistant teachers and tutors to those who are behind them in the same peer grouping. (In terms of grades, that would amount to K-4, with grade 4 helping with tutoring; 5-6; 7-10, with grade 10 tutoring and teaching; four years of early college; graduate work.)

Some points should be made within the discussion of new articulation procedures, however. One is that Calasanctius proves that as many as three years can be cut off the present structure if that is the goal. It also proves that an integrating rationale can be used to bring more information, more understanding, and more utility of knowledge to students in a quicker way than mere piling one on the other of discrete subjects or courses. Moreover it proves that students can be brought to a greater enjoyment of learning than usual by keeping them working up to their best abilities.

There are many who would argue that all Calasanctius proves is that if you have bright enough students, you can do almost anything you want. I would dispute that. Looking at the program, listening to the students, and seeing the school at work, one gets the feeling that elements other than I.Q. are responsible for the success. There is an administration that believes totally in what the school is doing, a strong faculty that believes in itself and the students, a group of parents that support the work of the school and their own children, a group of students who are proud of their school and of their own achievement, and a framework that does not force the students into unwarranted early maturity.

Granted, the greatest potential problems are avoided by putting the academic program in a nonresidential setting. Granted also, the acceleration puts the students too far ahead for many of them to handle the shift to college as quickly as their academic program makes possible. But that is the fault of colleges in not providing for early entrance programs that genuinely deal with the problems of younger-than-usual students, not of Calasanctius School.

The one element of Calasanctius that almost certainly demands the high I.Q. ability of the students is the pressure. But that is not a necessity for getting young men and women ready for college at age 16, as the experience of Simon's Rock indicates. I would submit that any school system could achieve the basic results of Calasanctius with a far more ordinary group of students as far as I.Q. is concerned, but it would need the same faculty, administrative, and parental support, and the same pride of the students. It is not, however, necessary to get all students through advanced calculus by 16 (or ever, as far as that goes), or a full range of training in systematic theology and comparative religion, valuable as that may be. Nor do they all need biology, chemistry, and physics before reaching college.

There are necessary changes that need to be made, however. What is commonly thought of as high school work should be started as early as fifth and sixth grades. Upgrading the secondary school program is not enough. Our present system of schooling simply does not challenge our students early enough. A thorough going study of man as it is exemplified in the social sciences should begin much earlier than it does now. Calasanctius is right in putting a developmental psychology course at a point that matches the beginning of puberty in the students. Ethics is not a subject to be delayed until college age. An interdisciplinary study of history should start

early and continue throughout secondary school. And it needs vertical integration rather than consisting of a series of "units" piled on top of one another in some haphazard way.

"Off-campus" experiences help force students into relating their lives and their studies. A day field trip is fun and educationally exciting, as I think any of us can testify from our own school experiences. Annual trips of a longer duration, with some physical hardships, aimed at a sequence of real investigations into geological, geographical, economic, social, anthropological, scientific and cultural questions have a cumulative effect that is much greater than the sum of the parts.

Of all the parts of the Calasanctius program that can be models for other schools, probably the most important is the seminar program. First, it trains the students in genuine independent study and thus is the best preparation for superior college work. Most of what usually goes under the title of independent study in grammar and high school is misnamed. It is usually neither real independence nor real study. As a matter of fact, it usually clouds the distinction between research and plagiarism. It is not that it is given too early; it is that it is too unfocused and unguided. Moreover, it once again tends to be a discrete event with no followup. The fact that at Calasanctius the student has to defend his thesis is an essential part of the program. Call it an advanced form of "show and tell," but it means that the student has to invest a good deal of himself in his work, and is given a good deal of help in learning how to do his study so that he is not left helpless in his public display.

The corollary of the seminar subject at Calasanctius is the use of external proctors. Young people can learn far more than any individual school can teach by working closely with adults in the real world. And just as important, there are in every community people in all walks of life who would enjoy working one hour a week with eager young people who want to learn more about the subjects the adults either know in their daily activities or in their own avocational interests.

Calasanctius is a unique school, but it has within its program a set of ideas that are eminently appropriate for use in schools elsewhere.

International Baccalaureate

As with AP, there is an easy way for a school to begin consideration of the International Baccalaureate. Materials and advice can be

obtained from the IB Office, 888 Seventh Avenue, New York, New York 10019. For the program to be successful, it must be seen as a complete two-year sequence offering as many options as possible. Not only must the faculty be able academically to teach the courses, but they should also have the capability to construct a workable Theory of Knowledge course, foster and handle independent study projects, and be able to work within the inevitable tension of teaching their own courses in such a way that the students will be able to do well on the international examinations. Let me not be misleading; the examination questions are not such that a student can "prepare" for them as one can, for example, for SATs or Regents Examinations. But they require genuine mind sets concerning types of analysis, philosophical approaches to problems, etc. No school should consider entering IB unless it has the right faculty.

The administration should proceed carefully. Faculty meetings in which the program is explained in detail will be necessary. Teachers who will be involved with the courses must be given ample time to consider the syllabi and exams before being asked whether they favor the IB. Without the support of most (I would say an overwhelming majority) of the faculty, the program is not likely to succeed. The more involved the faculty is, the better. The experience of many schools supports the idea that the IB courses should make up the majority of the junior and senior courses in the school (at least of the college preparatory kind), but that students should be given local grades based on term papers, classwork, and so on, as well as IB examination grades. This permits students to take some of the courses without being tied to the diploma. It also allows them the choice of taking either the IB or the AP exams. And if there is a high correlation between course grading and exam grading as seems true at UNIS, those students who do not do well in examination situations can be spared the trauma of the testing and simply receive high school grades. In those cases perhaps good work on the part of a concerned guidance counselor can at least eliminate the repetition of work in college.

Faculty should be urged to correspond with the chief examiners, especially in the earlier years of the program. The more at ease the teachers feel with the program, the more at ease the students will be.

Once the faculty has become convinced of the value of IB and the students have become involved in discussions, a series of public meetings attended by a wide range of community leaders and par-

ents should be held. No board of education these days will vote a $4,000 annual item without assurance of community support. State laws that might apply to such external payments must be studied, and financial and curriculum arrangements must be tailored to fit those laws. For example, it is almost certain that in some states all the IB courses will have to be open to all takers because of the cost factor. Double grading for high school credits and IB will be mandatory in many cases. There should be no remaining legal questions by the time of the first public meeting.

The administration must be able to explain clearly the difference between quality education and elitist education, as the issue is sure to arise. Moreover, statements from a variety of colleges, public and private, about their willingness to accept IB students with advanced standing should be obtained early. At some point IB schools should begin to make their moves toward A.A. certification for the IB diploma, but they will have to get together and build a strong case on the basis of college performance of their graduates and on test scores on examinations, for example the CLEP Subject Examinations as well as the General Examinations.

Private institutions will not have the same problems as public ones. But they will be less likely to adopt the program unless they have a large international clientele. As I see it, the basic problem for private schools remains: if a faculty is good enough to offer the IB, it is probably good enough to develop its own academic program, and the advantage of advanced standing in colleges will continue to be gained through AP. But if a school is looking for a proven overall curriculum with national and international recognition, and if it wants to adopt such a curriculum without going through the hassle of designing its own, then IB offers a first-rate choice.

Footnotes

1. An up-to-date study of the current status of the three-year degree programs is in the Winter 1977 issue of the *Carnegie Quarterly*.
2. A description of the Roy-Weber State Program is in the Fall 1974 issue of *The College Board Review*.
3. Gerard Renaud, *Experimental Period of the International Baccalaureate*. Paris: UNESCO, 1974.

High School–College Programs

The greatest growth in the granting of college credit to courses taught in high school has been in programs offered by certain colleges and universities on participating secondary school campuses. There are now so many of them that it would be impossible to put together a completely up-to-date list. I will concentrate on three, both because I know more about them and because they are representative of three different types.

There is one kind of program that I shall not deal with because it is so completely dependent on specific locations and schedules: when a college faculty member offers a course for college credit in a high school. Questions of teaching load, faculty salary, usurpation of high school faculty positions, all require unique solutions. Anyone interested in learning how one such program works should be in touch with either The Office of Special Programs, C.W. Post Center, Long Island University, P. O. Greenvale, New York, or the Chaminade High School. Faculty from C.W. Post teach an entire twelfth grade curriculum for college credit at Chaminade.

Project Advance

Perhaps the most complete network, and probably the largest project of college-high school coursework based in a private university is Syracuse University's "Project Advance." Currently, 55 schools in New York and one school, in a pilot project, in New Jersey are involved, and there is a strong possibility that as many as six schools in Massachusetts will soon be included. The idea began in 1971, when Dr. Robert Diamond, as part of an instructional development program at Syracuse, introduced a self-paced freshman English course that had a highly structured syllabus based on goal achievement. In 1973 two courses, English and psychology went off-campus, and 400 students in six schools were enrolled. By the fall of 1975, the number of students had jumped to 3,400, and schools from Buffalo to Long Island were participating.

Acceptance by other colleges was immediate. All but about seven colleges and universities to which students from Project Advance have applied have accepted the courses either for full credit or for exemption from similar courses. According to Syracuse, 80 percent of the colleges to which students have applied have granted both exemption and graduation credit; 17 percent of the colleges have granted just exemption. This is a higher record of credit acceptance than either AP or IB can claim, and the reason is not hard to find: the student receives a regular Syracuse University transcript for

the course. It is, in other words, part of the academic club. When a student has any difficulty securing credit, Syracuse provides support for the student.

The reason that Syracuse can take the role it does as a university is the constant validation of not only the courses but of the individual students in the courses at all participating schools. There are no doubts about what is happening in all Project Advance courses: the syllabi are set, the textbooks are uniform, and the teachers subject to annual visits and to periodic seminar refresher courses. The reasons for exporting specific course content are to protect Syracuse accreditation and to insure transfer credit.

There is no evidence that Project Advance has changed admissions patterns at Syracuse. However, the program does increase the university's "visibility." There is little, if any, financial profit. The involved schools I visited claim that any excess funds Syracuse accrues from Project Advance students are used to upgrade the program.

Financial arrangements are precise. Student fees are $15 per credit hour and are paid direct to Syracuse. Participating schools pay only for the teachers' initial training session. There are minimum numbers of students required for a course to be offered (usually 15) and a maximum beyond which the class cannot go (usually 25). Other students may take the course for high school credit only, but the total number in a class must be kept below the maximum number. The high school must supply the instructional materials to all the students, which run about $20-$25 per student per course on starting the program, but continuation costs are low.

Faculty members are chosen by the local schools rather than by Syracuse although guidelines are provided. For example, participating teachers are required to have an undergraduate major or a master's degree in the subject they are teaching; they must have had at least three years' teaching experience; two teachers must be trained for each course so that there is no chance that illness or accident to one teacher will endanger the continuation of a course throughout the year. The university's professors that work with the program are required to have qualifications equivalent to that of graduate school faculty.

Each summer, ten day workshops are offered for new teachers. The cost is $450 per person per subject. Instructional materials are included in that fee. Up to three school teachers from a school may enroll for each workshop, which is limited in size to 25. Syracuse at-

tempts to arrange the workshops in a region where the teachers can get to the sessions easily. At least half the school districts involved do not cover any of the costs for the individual teacher. Some are required by law not only to cover the costs but also to pay the teachers for their attendance. The high school teachers may gain three graduate credit hours for the workshop at half the usual Syracuse cost if they wish to do so.

Attendance at the workshops is required. It does not matter whether a teacher has had previous college teaching experience or not. The emphasis on comparability of the courses tends to eliminate individualistic teachers, and the teachers must agree that the course outline is good. Moreover, the flexible time-frame plan and self-paced curriculum causes many new teachers considerable problems.

Each year every teacher must attend two one-day seminars, at no cost. These seminars are treated as faculty meetings, but the emphasis is on subject matter. Also, one day each semester a Syracuse faculty member visits each course, checks papers for standards (a folder of all work is kept for each student), talks with the students about the program, and discusses community feelings with school administrators. Sample papers are regularly sent to Syracuse for checking. Both school and Syracuse faculty find that individual school grading is often more strict than the standards required by the university.

Basically, Syracuse requires that the courses be taken in the senior year, especially the English course. One reason is the difference in maturity between juniors and seniors. In general the students enrolled are among the top 15 percent of the student body. It seems true that a fairly large number of students in Project Advance would not qualify by AP standards, but their performance is unquestionably equal to that of Syracuse freshmen.

There are six courses currently offered under Project Advance: English, psychology, sociology, calculus, biology, and brass methods. In English a student must enroll for six credit hours but may get credit for less, depending on how far he or she proceeds. In calculus the students enroll for three credits originally but that can change. The course is arranged for flexible credit, and a student earns a separate grade for each credit.

A quick overview of the English course will give an indication of the kind of work required in the program. First, the student is given an objective test covering basic skills such as grammar, punc-

tuation, and so on. If there is an indication of weakness, the student is put on a self-paced, self-instruction schedule which, when completed, is expected to provide the necessary basic skills for the next two levels. No credit is awarded for the basic skills track. The next level is the expository writing or essay track. The goal is to develop the ability to write a 500 word essay in one hour. To pass this track the student must get a "pass" on two consecutive in-class papers. Evaluation of these papers, incidentally, is done by oral comments on cassettes rather than comments written in the papers' margins. Obviously this track does not require the best level of writing as it is admittedly aimed at the test-writing situation. The student manual sets forth with equal clarity what the minimal standards of performance are. The student receives one credit for this level.

The next level, or the literature and independent writing track, consists of two minicourses of six weeks in fiction and in poetry, with two papers, the first one 500 words in length, and the second, 1,000 words. These are followed either by two minicourses developed by the teacher and an independent study paper or one minicourse and two independent study papers. The minicourses have to be submitted to Syracuse for acceptance, with the proposal outlining the subject, materials, and papers to be required. Each minicourse requires two papers totaling 1,500 words and each independent study paper must be 2,000 words long. The purpose of the independent study requirement is to teach research methods.

None of this is very startling, nor is it meant to be. The purpose is to give an exactly equivalent course in a participating school to that which is being given on campus at Syracuse. And that is exactly what happens in Project Advance.

The advantages of Project Advance are clear. Everyone involved knows exactly what is going on. The student knows on entering exactly what will be expected, and if the students have been selected carefully, there is a good chance of success. Participating teachers deal directly with university faculty members, and a feeling of mutual respect grows quickly. High school teachers in the program are given adjunct faculty status at Syracuse – but receive no extra remuneration. The student has an unambiguous university grade transcript at the end of the process. And perhaps just as important to all concerned, the grade for a course is based on an ongoing class process rather than a single exam at the end of the year.

The disadvantages are almost equally clear. A faculty member is tied to a course that is determined in large measure by someone

else, not only in general terms, but often in specific weekly assignments, texts, and course structure. The quality of performance is tied to that of the freshman English program of Syracuse rather than to a national standard, as in AP for example. The student is largely limited to taking the courses in the senior year, so that self-pacing can be deceptive. A slow pace at the beginning may well mean the impossibility of completing the work by June. It is true that credits are awarded for separate units, but partial crediting will mean inevitable hassles in course assignments at college. In the first study of student transfers to college, only 15 percent indicated that they thought that Project Advance was going to lead to earlier graduation. There is no indication that colleges are treating Project Advance courses as they do AP or IB, where three courses will gain a student sophomore standing. Thus, for the student to gain a full year in the articulation process, he or she would have to take the full range of Project Advance courses or combine some with other college offerings. And that is possible at many schools, where Project Advance is but one of several programs. On Long Island the other programs are usually those offered by C.W. Post and Adelphi College.

SCALE

The C.W. Post Center of Long Island University has established a relatively open system of coursework for college credit with a number of Long Island schools known as SCALE (Secondary/Collegiate Articulated Learning Experience). The schools agree to recommend qualified teachers to C.W. Post, subject to review by department chairmen and the dean at the center. These teachers are, as at Syracuse, given adjunct faculty status. In each department at the center a faculty member is given the responsibility of developing and coordinating college course equivalents. Each course is developed cooperatively by the high school and college faculty, making sure that the basic course content equals that of the same course at C.W. Post. The Post faculty members keep in touch with the high school teachers and give occasional lectures. C.W. Post also agrees to do some inservice training of high school faculty members, but that takes many different forms.

The students must have an 80 average, must have completed eleventh grade, and must be recommended by the guidance office of their schools as well as have parental permission. Each course costs a student about $50, payable directly to C.W. Post.

The open-ended nature of the working agreement between C.W. Post and the individual schools is such that a very wide range of offerings could be developed. In practice, the same basic offerings as those of other programs tend to predominate – the courses that students most often confront as they begin college: calculus, biology, sociology, etc. – but others also show up in high school listings, political theory, music theory, accounting, zoology, for example.

Transfer credit is not as automatic as for Project Advance. Although the same college transcript situation holds true, the element of immediate and unquestioned equality of course work is not present. Also, C.W. Post does not have Syracuse's national reputation. But for the colleges in the area that most of the students attend, transferability of credit is relatively uncomplicated.

For both the teacher and the student the C.W. Post program has some real advantages. The high school teacher not only has an equal share in planning the course but has much more freedom in the way in which it is taught. For the student, the guest lecture feature provides a real sense of being connected with a college. As the students actually apply for admission to C.W. Post before enrolling in courses, they are entitled to use the facilities of the college, such as the library and the student center. Thus the beginning of a physical shift says something about the senior year being the real beginning of college.

One comment needs to be added: there is every reason to believe that the C.W. Post program has recruiting purposes, although there is no evidence that any undue pressures are put on the students to elect C.W. Post as their first-choice college.

Adelphi

C.W. Post's program stands about half-way between Project Advance and Adelphi College's high school program. Adelphi chooses its adjunct faculty members on the basis of a long and very close interview of teachers recommended by the high school administrations. But once the appointment is made, in the words of one such teacher, "You're treated as a professional." An adjunct faculty member cannot offer anything he wants, but is responsible for developing a course after he suggests it to the department chairman at Adelphi, and he is responsible for the way it is taught and graded (although tests are shared with the department at the college). In the best of all possible worlds this, it seems to me, is the kind of working arrangement that is the best answer to high school/college

articulation courses, but this is not, of course, the best of all possible worlds. As might be expected, different course titles begin to show up, for example, "Comic Vision," Spanish VI, Probability and Statistics, The Bible in Western Literature. One teacher who taught both Project Advance and Adelphi courses looked upon the latter as fun, a kind of release from the pressure of the Syracuse course. I would wager that his students did also. But I do not mean to imply that there was any lessening of standards in the way he taught the course.

As with SCALE, the student applies for admission to Adelphi, pays the $50 course fee directly to the college, and has all the campus privileges of a regular student there. Apparently more students take advantage of this situation at Adelphi than at C.W. Post, but the difference between the two institutions makes that understandable. Adelphi courses tend to be a little larger than the others we have been discussing, since there is a minimum number of 20 students for a course to "go."

The strength of the Adelphi program is the greater freedom and hence more potential individuality of teaching and enthusiasm in the courses. The strong individualist that was not desired in Project Advance has a real place in the Adelphi program, as long as his individualism is not sheer idiosyncrasy. Where the school is close enough, the student has an even greater chance to feel himself part of the ongoing life of a college campus and to make some of the social transition before he actually leaves high school.

The weaknesses are the potential lack of verification of the level of work demanded in the course, a lack of necessary contact with another person in the field to help stimulate a teacher to perform at his best and keep student performance equally high, an absence of any structure that would demand independent work from the student – so important for this early college experience.

Hauppauge High School

One high school provides a blending of all three programs: Hauppauge Senior High School in Hauppauge, New York, a school of 2,500 students in grades 9-12 in a middle income, suburban community on Long Island. Of the graduates, 63 percent go on for further education.

For a long time the school offered AP courses, but for the past three years it has shifted its attention to courses offering credit from specific colleges. Besides the three college programs we have

been looking at, the school offers two photography courses from Dowling College. Last year, Hauppauge offered its seniors (and a few juniors) 16 college courses (for a total possible 54 credits) that earned the students college transcripts. In three years, enrollments in college courses have tripled. Of the 519 students in the senior class, between 225 and 250 accounted for 365 enrollments in these courses, and that number is expected to increase. The school's principal would like to add a thirteenth year and give the students a chance to take enough courses to graduate with an A.A. degree.

The reasons for beginning what may very well be the "largest program of college/high school articulation in the country" are the familiar ones: "Senioritis" (they had tried the familiar way of offering a variety of electives, minicourses, and so on, and it just didn't work); repetition of courses in the freshman year of college; the financial problems of parents facing rising college tuitions. About six years ago the school had an early release program that permitted students to attend classes at area colleges, but that interfered seriously with the social life of the school and made class ranking impossible.

The teachers at the school with whom I spoke had usually had experience with more than one of the college programs, so they could make interesting comparisons. Project Advance was deemed the most demanding. The teachers felt it was really an honest program, both for the students and also for themselves because of the interactions they had with the Syracuse people. They were impressed that the visitors read everything in a student's folder. They felt that because the structure was clear there was a good deal of freedom within it. The principal is very strong on using exactly the same materials that the colleges do and believes that a 40 percent leeway is enough for a teacher to have.

Descriptions of relationships with C.W. Post varied, but were all positive. One teacher had taught a course at C.W. Post and wanted closer contact with his former associates there. Another sits in, at the college, at nights on the same course he is teaching and so he teaches it the same way and likes working that way. Another feels very little control from the college and feels free to develop the curriculum his own way. But as he also sees the course as a very basic one of fundamentals, there is no real problem of discrepancy. All saw the visiting lecturers as one of the most valuable parts of SCALE. They give the students a real sense of being in college, and it is also a nice chance for academic conversation for the faculty.

On the question of the maturity of the performance by the students, replies were mixed. Several thought that there was a real gap between the goals of the faculty and the performance of the students, between what the teacher attempts and the students actually do. One faculty member offered an interesting observation: students are aware that they should be bringing their lives into their work because the faculty stress it, but most of the students don't. They feel that if they do, they have to submit their experience to control and rational discrimination, and they're not willing to do that yet. Another teacher felt that even the best were not yet capable of really synthesizing the information they were gaining.

The element of independent study varies from course to course. In the Project Advance English course it is an important part that is built in very carefully. In sociology it lies mainly in the choice of topics for the five papers each term.

From the students' point of view, all three programs are a success, and they mirror faculty views on the differences among the colleges. They think Project Advance keeps the closest contact, C.W. Post next, and Adelphi least. When asked whether they were aware of which program they were in, they said they were "because of registration hassles." The students are, as is usual in such programs, bright, verbal, and outgoing. They felt the college courses demanded higher standards than regular high school courses, that they were indeed encouraged to bring their full lives into their academic work (although they felt that few of the students did so), that the college programs did not divide the student body into groups (and it was clear simply watching the various mixes of students in the halls during the day that this had not happened), that the cost of the courses was not important, nor (and this point is not an easy one to deal with) was the fact that taking the course might save some money later, and above all that there was no doubt in their minds that they were doing college work. It was also clear that the school had chosen the faculty for the programs wisely. They were respected and genuinely liked by the students.

The question remains: Why is the program so small? Although nearly half the seniors are taking one college course, there are probably fewer than five who are taking a full set of college courses and not many more than that who will have earned enough credits to make acceleration of the four year college sequence possible.

Several reasons are given by faculty and administrators, ranging

from the observation that most of those who are taking the courses are simply doing it to get their feet wet in preparation for college to the complaint that "kids are procrastinators." The students point to a more basic problem: they see student participation depending on whether a given student sees the harder courses as a challenge or whether he or she is intimidated by them. One administrator feels that the two college courses that fulfill Regents requirements – English and social sciences – have a reputation for being very difficult. In a senior class of 500, only 30 students take the college English course.

Here lies a genuine problem. The teachers of these two courses would agree, nay, rather glory in the charge. Everyone talks about the pressure in the English course, including the very popular head teacher. He says it comes from the requirement that two papers, one short and one long, be prepared every six weeks. But I do not think this is the main reason. The reading assignments, however, are very heavy. At one point students read seven of Shakespeare's plays in six weeks in addition to writing the required two papers, and there may also be some remaining work on the students' independent study projects.

The pressure is cultivated for its own sake. One of the strange characteristics of secondary education is the assumption that advanced work must necessarily be difficult. I think this is one reason that all the math teachers I spoke to in secondary schools said that they were unable to get across the concept of elegancy, the elegant solution rather than simply an accurate one. I sometimes encountered this "hardness" syndrome at Simon's Rock among those students who had just entered from high school. They were inclined to judge the level of a course by "how hard it is." Depth of understanding or perception may or may not be "hard." The ability to see that a problem has no solution may represent a far higher level of education than the ability to solve difficult problems correctly.

Unfortunately, the "hardness," label is an easy one to use to convince administrators, teachers, and parents that a course is really college level. But it may also hinder the nurturing of genuine understanding and mature thought. It certainly acts as a stumbling block to the creation of a milieu for bringing a larger number of able students into the high school-college articulation program.

At the same time a positive trade-off has occurred at Hauppauge High School. The "failure" of the program to attract more students or to convince those who do participate to take more of the offered

courses means that no visible clique has appeared. But it is more than simply a question of visibility. Since there is really no greater tendency for a student to take several courses with any particular group of students than there is at any school, there is no feeling that there is a separate group of "college students" in the school even though there is a group of "college courses."

Nevertheless, the problem of potentially misleading promotion does exist. As long as students are limited to taking the college courses in the senior year, and as long as they take only one or two, they are not going to save any on college tuition. For the family that can afford an extra 50 or 100 dollars, there is no problem. But for the family that must save every possible penny to handle college costs, the extra expenditure is an unnecessary burden.

Hauppauge High School recognizes the problem and is consciously encouraging students to take more college courses. The administration is also considering running a bus for elderly citizens to bring them to school to take the college courses. As elsewhere, there is every reason to believe that the combination of adolescents and older adults in the classroom will be an exciting educational experience for both groups.

How to Initiate a High School–College Program

There are a number of different ways for a school to begin a program of high school/college articulation courses. Each state and each locale provides different opportunities. Various state programs in Florida are considered to be saving the state $6,000,000 annually.[1] New York State colleges and universities have at least 18 programs in operation. In addition to the ones already mentioned there are "Bridge Programs" operating out of Marist College (Poughkeepsie); St. Joseph's College (Brooklyn); Marymount Manhattan; SUNY–Brockport, Fredonia, Plattsburgh, and Buffalo; College of Mount Saint Vincent; St. John's University; The College of Staten Island; Wagner College; and a number of community colleges.[2] The University of Connecticut has a working arrangement with 80 high schools (public and private) across the state. In Rhode Island students from 20 high schools have taken college courses from 12 colleges, including the University of Rhode Island and Brown University.[3]

Those who wish to know more about Project Advance should contact its Associate Director at Syracuse. Queries addressed to SCALE at C.W. Post or to the appropriate high school–college articulation

office at Adelphi should receive speedy answers. But schools are advised to contact colleges in their neighboring areas. High school students can benefit greatly from having the privileges of a college campus, being permitted to use the library, for example. Occasional lectures by faculty are especially useful and stimulating for high school students in the program.

There seems to be little doubt that a multiple college arrangement also has benefits. Just as colleges have some departments that are stronger than others, so some colleges offer better arrangements for some course offerings than others for a particular school. In the same way, a school should not necessarily limit the types of colleges from which it derives courses. Because today colleges offer a wide range of courses for credit, the limitation of the numbers and kinds of college courses previously offered by schools is not necessarily still appropriate. At no time, of course, should the integrity of the school curriculum be violated in quest of college credit.

A school would do well to check out the colleges and universities to which their students go or want to go in order to find out which programs and courses will be accepted for transfer credit. In selling the students and parents on such a program, the school must be able to be specific about what the program will be able to accomplish in time and money-saving.

The school should begin from the very start to indicate not only the necessity of taking a number of college courses if they are to represent any real change in the articulation process, but also the value in doing so. The courses should relate to one another in such a way that there is a heightened value to each. With skillful planning, the faculty and guidance counselors can fashion combinations of courses that have real integrative value. They can insure that at least one course gives the student training and experience in independent study. Perhaps one college can be found that will accredit an interdisciplinary course that can be the core of the college credit program.

There are two problems that must be considered as the program fills more of a student's time and as more students in a school take part in the program. The first is the amount of pressure and work load, the second is the potential for social fragmentation.

The pressure on a student should be less than for a college freshman. The course load (five courses concurrently) is the same, but one has a 30 week school year and the other has one of 40 weeks.

Moreover, the usual college class meets two or three times a week whereas in high school five times is common. Instead of trying to expand the amount of work in the college level course to fill the longer time period, a teacher should try to allow more time for thought and appreciation, should try to help the students develop a love for learning, to perceive relationships, and above all to relate their lives to their schooling. If a teacher is afraid that he is not "covering" enough work, he can easily investigate comparable college courses, talk with cooperating college faculty, and read college students' papers and examinations for comparison. I believe there is no need to create pressure on the students artificially and that it is destructive to do so. Where possible, it should be eliminated.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be true of the social complications. The more a small group of students share a common set of experiences different from those of the larger group of which it is part, the more separated it becomes. But if experiences are more commonly shared, separation will be less marked. The best solution, then, would be to have all students in a senior class take a full load of college courses. Since that is unworkable in most contexts, the next best solution is to have all students take at least one college course. That is probably possible if the range of courses is sufficiently broad and if the quality of the rest of the academic program is high. In none of the programs I have described above is taking a course for credit – and therefore payment of a fee – required.

The greater the number of college programs being offered, the less likely smaller groups within the subgroup will form. I can envisage a large school situation in which only two different college programs were offered; the students would probably begin to identify themselves as students of one of the colleges as opposed to the other. For that reason also there should probably be only one college offering in each subject. Otherwise faculty and students might well get involved in the age-old "my course is better ('more like college') than yours is."

But there seems little doubt that the more successful a college course program, the greater the potential there is for social breakdown, and schools need to plan for it. Another important aspect – the problem of interscholastic and intercollegiate athletics – is very difficult. But it is a complex subject and beyond the scope of this discussion.

Faculty Problems

What to an outsider might appear to be a potential source of trouble – the selection of teachers for the courses – does not seem to be. Of course, a good deal of potential bitterness is defused by the fact that the participating colleges have the final say and can always be blamed in cases of unhappy teachers who are not chosen. At the moment probably the chief cause of peace is the recognition that the teachers who are involved are working very hard – perhaps harder than their associates – and receiving no extra pay or benefits for doing so. But as the program grows and more teachers are involved, rivalry, hurt over not being chosen, discontent at being chosen, and examples of incompetence are bound to arise. It is not likely to create any more problems than any administrator has to deal with today, and at least two different institutions can share the blame. Also, the unmeasurable quality working against the discontent should not be discounted in the final analysis – the high school teacher is aware that he has an official position as an adjunct faculty member at a college or university.

The school should study not only the potential offerings of different colleges, but also the nature and quality of its own faculty. Different kinds of faculty will respond best in different situations, obviously. Where there is any doubt about faculty qualifications, a strongly-structured college program is the best answer. Where there is a superb but highly individualistic teacher, a course offered under a more liberal college is called for. Perhaps the best reason for trying to utilize several different college programs is the obvious one: the integrity of an educational institution lies in its ability to develop its own educational plan and requirements for its students.

Footnotes

1. *Carnegie Quarterly*, Winter 1977, p. 3.
2. For the Staten Island Bridge Program, see *Spectrum*, Vol I., no. 1. April 1977. For other documents relating to new articulation methods in New York State, see State Education Department documents *What Should We Do With Our Senior Year?* (1975), *Bridge Programs for High School Seniors* (June 1975), and *High-School College Articulation in Middle States Secondary Schools in New York State* (1975).
3. "Concurrent enrollment" has been encouraged by the State Department of Education, which has kept track of the various programs and could be contacted for more information.

Early Admission

The original answer to the whole problem of high school-college articulation, and certainly the most obvious, was early admission. Most colleges have, at one time or another, allowed an individual student who has not completed high school into the freshman class. Several years ago the Educational Testing Service released figures showing that more than 600 colleges regularly admitted students early. As mentioned earlier, the Ford Foundation sponsored a nationwide program of early admission in the early 1950s. Many colleges are considering an expanded program in early admission to compensate partially for the decreasing number of applicants from their usual pool. But except for the colleges that took part in the Ford program, most early admission programs are haphazard at best, with unclear requirements, little if any followup, a sink-or-swim attitude toward the students by the institution, and an almost total disinterest in or disregard for any of the information we now have about these younger-than-normal college entrants.

Recently some programs have started that do try to utilize relevant information in building a curriculum or creating a college atmosphere that supports the early admission situation. We will examine two of these--the first at the New School for Social Research, and the other at the University of Delaware.

Ford Program

The first students in the Ford Early Admission Program, 420 in number, entered the 12 different colleges in 1951 and were handled in a number of different ways. In at least four, Yale, Wisconsin, Utah, and Fisk, special programs were established for the early entrants. At least five colleges, Fisk, Yale, Columbia, Oberlin, and Goucher required them to live together in a separated situation. All colleges except Shimer required that the students be better than the average incoming freshman at that institution. All the colleges had advising situations clearly established for the students, but few had the kind of counseling services that colleges provide today. The only restriction universally maintained was that, because of the age of the students in the group, they could not be rushed for fraternities or sororities the first year. Students were aware that they were participants in a special program, as studies were made of their work, they were required to fill in various questionnaires, and so on.

After the first year a major change occurred. The special programs were dropped at all the colleges except Yale, which retained

its program of Directed Study but allowed other freshmen in it as well. The colleges relaxed most of the social barriers they had erected around the younger students except for the rules concerning fraternities because so-called "Nurseries" had been created on campuses, and the young students had borne the brunt of a great deal of cruel humor.

The results were: class standings of the early admission students were considerably higher than were those of the comparison group (those with the same test scores but who had completed high school and were in general a year or more older); Graduate Record Examination performance by the early scholars was consistently higher (from 8 percent to 23 percent) than that of the comparison group; as sophomores the early scholars scored well over 35 percent higher on Graduate Record Examination (GRE) Area Tests than seniors nationally; the scholars also showed a higher gain between their sophomore and senior GRE test results than the comparison group; twice as many scholars made Phi Beta Kappa as did those from the comparison group; the scholars seemed to adjust to freshman year at college as well as the comparison students (with the variation that more showed "excellent" adjustment and more showed "poor" or "very poor"); the scholars seemed almost as well adjusted at the end of the four years as the comparison group, but not as well as at the end of the first year (in this regard, their class ranking dropped perceptibly during the junior year and the comparison group was almost equal); and finally, it is true that a significantly higher percentage of scholars admitted to having adjustment problems even though they felt they had managed to solve them. Interviews with the students did reveal a large number of cases in which social events (dances for example) caused real problems for the younger than normal student. Many insisted that although they were very much in favor of the program, they felt that students should be at least as competent academically as they themselves were in order to stand the pressure.

It must be kept continually in mind that the time under discussion is the first part of the 50s, when college regulations were still remarkably strict, rather than the 60s or 70s, when almost all social restrictions were dropped by colleges.

A Case Study

One case study will provide an example of the type of student who took advantage of the Ford Program. Robert Fuller entered Oberlin

College after having completed tenth grade at the age of 15 at Chatham High School, New Jersey. As in the case of so many students with the desire to move ahead more quickly, there was at least one first-rate teacher involved. In Fuller's case it was a Latin teacher, and perhaps also a biology teacher. Fuller makes the point that almost any average high school has a couple of good teachers who help good students find themselves. He stayed at Oberlin for three years and left. He went to Paris on a fellowship, wandered around Europe for a year, returned to complete a master's degree before heading for Chicago to study economics for a year ("to fill in his general education"). He completed a Ph.D. at Princeton nine years after entering Oberlin, and still only 24 years old. He subsequently held various academic positions and fellowships, also a deanship, and finally he returned to Oberlin in 1970, at the age of 33, as president of the college.

Dr. Fuller's life pattern is similar to that of other early admission students who not only skip the high school diploma, but bypass the B.A. degree as well. If they move between two institutions they take off a year or two, change majors, or do something to get back within a year of their peer group, at least until they reach 19 or 20, when they then move ahead again at full speed. The early start seems to trigger a sense of educational continuity that jumps beyond institutional lines and provides a springboard to a sense of lifelong education. Moreover, it allows for a time of searching that deepens the institutional educational experience.

Fuller's description of his Oberlin early admissions experience illustrates the Ford study's statistics. Since he entered in the second year (1952) there were no social regulations that separated him from regular students. He didn't even know who the other Ford Scholars were. He feels he perhaps made a mistake in letting other students know his age, but he was tall and made the basketball team, which helped a good deal. He recalls, however, that the freshman year was difficult for him, and for a number of his associates, and he acknowledges that perhaps the average student couldn't make it, although, as he says, he does not like to admit that. Fuller is like most supporters of early college work who would really like to argue that everyone should skip a year or two, but truth keeps breaking in.

Academically he found himself unprepared for one of the vital pieces of preparation that high school teachers ought to transmit to the college bound: that "important stuff still has to be memo-

rized." Or, put a different way, "there is a need to have both memorization and general approaches to handle college work." He was, however, prepared for independent study, the other vital component.

Fuller argues that the Ford Program would work far more widely than the study showed. He feels that the high schools are doing a terrible job in the last two years and that students should be allowed to go on to college. You can't keep them in high school and expect college maturity work. He feels that the social barriers and problems have less to do with having friends of the same age than they do with the individual. High school life can be just as brutalizing as entering college social life a year early; maybe even more so, since at college there is a greater tolerance on the part of students regarding each others' behavior. He argues persuasively that such a program is more likely to work in 1977 than in 1952 because there is more understanding on the part of the colleges, more support personnel within college administrations. In the 50s deans had no training or experience in counseling; and did not have assistant deans and counseling offices as most colleges have now. And there were no trained faculty or staff living in the dorms, providing role models for the younger students.

Shimer

Shimer College in Mt. Carroll, Illinois, has a history that includes many of the educational developments discussed in this book. It began as a coeducational seminary in 1853. After the Civil War it was a six-year female seminary; in 1896 it became the Frances Shimer Academy of the University of Chicago offering a four-year college preparatory course; in 1908 a two-year junior college curriculum was added; an integrated four-year program was developed between 1944-50; and the Chicago College Program that led to the B.A. was adopted in 1950 along with a return to coeducation. Throughout this long history, the program was primarily intended for grades 11-14 and the age group 16-20. It is not surprising that Shimer was one of the first Ford early admission colleges. It is important to remember that the Ford plan almost exactly coincided with the beginning of the four-year B.A. program, although the first B.A. graduates received their degrees in 1952.

Ties with the University of Chicago were close, beginning in 1896 when William Rainey Harper established a board of trustees most of whose members were professors at the University of Chicago.

The team of faculty members that worked out the Shimer general education plan in the mid-to late 40s came west to Mt. Carroll from the university, and when the Chicago Program was adopted in 1950, all the characteristics of early entrance, testing for credits, and comprehensives were made part of the Shimer education as well. Until 1958 the University of Chicago even handled the Shimer admissions program. The curriculum, a modified great books plan, remains in place today. The official connection came to an end in 1958, after the first of a series of impending closings developed.

From 1908 to 1943 Frances Shimer College was very much like the middle college at Pasadena except that there were two separate programs at Shimer: the academy and the junior college. Everyone on the faculty taught at both levels, however, and thus had teaching experience with 16- and 17-year-olds. Faculty members who came from Chicago in the 40s were committed to early college work and had had experience with early entrants at the university. As a result, there was a good deal of paternalistic concern and a number of clear social regulations in the 50s, as well as a number of strong student support services, including a visiting psychiatrist. Only between 1944 and 1950, as an integrated four-year program was developed, did the institution begin to eliminate the two school structure and permit an accelerated program.

The rationale behind the program was much like that of Simon's Rock—a B.A. program in liberal arts with a field of concentration. Professional specialization was for graduate school. Since the faculty had already developed an integrated four-year liberal arts curriculum during the late 40s, accepting the Chicago Plan and awarding the B.A. required no basic change at Shimer. The college's hope that instituting a four-year program would eliminate the high school graduation group simply did not work. Attrition was very high, and it became necessary to recruit from the high school graduate pool. Shimer has never found the answer to that problem, and the percentage of early admits has dropped significantly (and by intention) in recent years.

The Shimer curriculum is one that ought to appeal to the 16-20 age group. Out of the 130 credit hours required for graduation, "90 comprise a systematic and integrated presentation of those knowledges and skills which are essential to intellectual and moral freedom and for responsible citizenship." There are three series of courses, in humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences, and a cluster of three courses called the "Integrating Courses," two in

history that bring the material of the three series together in a historical framework and a philosophy course that seeks "to clarify the relations among the disciplines." Then there are the usual concentrations that one finds in a liberal arts college for the remaining hours. Each of the three required series has a required comprehensive examination the student must pass for graduation.

Classes are small and discussions are intense. It would be difficult to find any college with a group of students who are more proud of the level of education they are receiving. Unfortunately, there is at times a level of intellectual snobbery that leads the occasional student to claim that no one else (with the exception of a University of Chicago or St. John's College student) can get a real education in comparison to that offered at Shimer. The faculty expect and get a very high level of performance from students whose average SAT scores total 1150.

Under the circumstances one is led to ask why the college has been repeatedly on the verge of closing since 1957. The reasons are complex, and include, among others: the financial situation, the size of the college, and its location. These all cause a high attrition rate. As one person on campus explained: a student is either drawn right in or drops out. In the early 70s many students came for one year and then transferred to other colleges.

The financial situation is very difficult. In 1965-66 the college was unable to meet its financial obligations by the beginning of the second semester. The student body was 550 at the time; by the fall of 1966 the enrollment was down to 400. There has been a continual slide to the present 184 full-time equivalents. Smallness leads to intense personal pressures not made any easier by a proportionately large number of early admission students. Historically 25 percent of the entering classes were early admits, but more came from eleventh grade than the tenth, and many came in the middle of the twelfth grade. Usually there are more early students for the spring semester than for the fall (which, if the Simon's Rock experience is a valid test, leads to more rather than fewer problems for the young student). The rural situation is a significant factor in the attrition rate. This was particularly true in the late 60s, when the town view of the college was that it was filled with "hippies, drug addicts, and Commies." There is still a gulf between the two communities, but not so much ill feeling.

The record of early admission students is not surprising. Studies of the first 20 years that followed the beginning of the Ford Pro-

gram show that 609 students entered as early admits, with an average age of 16 2/3. They were almost exactly divided between males and females. The average number of early entrants per class was 31. Only 31 percent of them completed their degrees at Shimer, but of those who did, 77 percent went on to graduate school and 19 percent went into teaching. Forty percent completed a B.A. in three years or less. While at Shimer they won most of the honors that were awarded.

In the last ten years the pattern has changed, perhaps partially because of problems arising in 1966, when 115 of a class of 187 were early admits and the college also ran out of money by midyear. Since then, 267 early entrants have been admitted, 55 percent of them female (67 percent were female in 1972). Fifty-five percent of early admits come from other states, while 80 percent of the regular students come from Illinois. Since the greatest discontent with the college comes from students that travel a long distance, this may be a factor in early admission attrition, but the figures may simply indicate the discontent factor of early admission. The early admission students in this recent period continue to have significantly higher high school GPAs, but their SAT scores resemble those of regular Shimer freshmen, and there is no evidence that there is any longer a real difference in achievement.

To an outsider the causes of the problem seem to result from the college's policy of making no distinction between early admission and regular students. Admission standards are the same, except that three recommendations instead of one are required, and there is an attempt to sort out risk cases. Interviews are encouraged but not required. All students are treated alike in the classroom; and there is no differentiation in housing, regulations, restrictions, and so on. Dormitories are all open. There was a period when one floor of one dorm was used for enforcing somewhat stricter regulations – at the request of parents – but that lasted only a short time, as did an attempt at another time to keep an eye on early entrants by checking them in occasionally. The college's position is that to treat these students differently would threaten the sense of community. The dean feels that the support services are there for those who need them and the college's policy of being attentive to each student's needs makes up for some of the openness. The only dorm staffing is done by upperclass students chosen by the dean with advice from the student government. There is a four county mental health facility that holds a clinic in town one day per week, and

severe problems are referred to a center that is a 45 minute drive away.

Several years ago, juniors and seniors began to complain about the lack of maturity of the early admission students and the concern is growing. Some faculty members think the higher the SAT score, the lower the level of maturity. In response to this concern, the percentage of early admissions was cut to 15 percent last September, and everyone I spoke to feels that has brought about a significant shift. In any case, there is no plan to change the treatment of the early admission group. Current attrition patterns seem consistent with those of the recent past. And the college's financial position remains rocky. (Since my visit, the president has resigned and a faculty troika is attempting to keep a remnant of the college alive.)

Pros and Cons

There are probably few examples in the field of early admissions where the pros and cons are more clearly set forth than in the Shimer program. A college with a long tradition of working with the very age group most affected by changes in articulation gradually lost the traditions that had made it an innovator in educational programs and substituted an academic policy that lost sight of the total needs of the adolescent. As one perceptive member of the college put it: "Shimer is so intellectual in its approach that it believes that all problems are subject to a rational solution." In other words, train the students' minds in rational thought, and they will be able to solve all the problems they face. It simply isn't true.

Shimer started with a seminary program that took students beyond the limits of a secondary education. Retreating temporarily to a preparatory program, it again branched out to include the first two years of college, but brought together a faculty that knew how to deal with students at both secondary and college levels. That same faculty developed an integrated program that achieved for the same age group a full college liberal arts program. At the moment that the college moved to a B.A. program, it lost control of the peer group and subordinated the students it had traditionally worked with to the demands of an older group. What was learned from the Ford study was deceptive. The college still had a faculty that was not only accustomed to dealing with younger students but enjoyed doing so and there were college social regulations and administrative support that provided the necessary security for the

younger students. Then the world of American college life changed, and everything that had made Shimer distinctive except the academic program was abandoned. It is also true that the college underwent excruciating financial pressures, of course, but it had withstood a threat of closing in 1957 and still continued successfully.

There can be no doubt of the validity, the strength, and the applicability of the Shimer academic program for both the 16-20 age group and the traditional college group. It has all the elements that have proved successful in other new articulation programs. But more than honesty is required of an educational institution when it works with students who are younger than the peer grouping into which they are introduced. Shimer has never misrepresented itself as far as early admissions is concerned. It has described the program as a sink-or-swim situation for young students. That is certainly the way it is—but whether the position is ethical in the light of what we know about 16-year-olds is a very different matter. And whether it is moral in an age of open dorms, a decay of sexual standards or guides, the availability of drugs of all kinds, I leave to the reader. It is indeed a sink-or-swim situation, but the college itself is now in danger of sinking. Unfortunately a remark made in an earlier chapter is all too relevant here: it is almost impossible for a college to move back to a more conservative set of social regulations once it has established a more liberal one.

Skidmore

For most colleges, the early admission program, where it can be identified as such, is but one arm of a full recruiting program, often joined with such activities as offering courses to students from local high schools, usually courses in science or language for students who have "used up" the course offerings of the schools. All too often little attention is paid to the students who are accepted under the title of early admission, and they simply become members of the incoming freshman class. Whether they perform better or less well than others in the class or whether they have any particular problems, it is not possible to establish.

Some colleges try to work on several different articulation patterns simultaneously, and there is greater opportunity to find out the varying degrees of success of those programs. One such college is Skidmore College in Saratoga Springs, New York, once a woman's college but coeducational for the last five years.

The range of activities that fall under the general heading of

high school-college articulation include a few students from Saratoga Springs who took a college course, usually math; a spring full-time release program in cooperation with several area high schools; early admission of a few students each year; and an experimental program under the aegis of the University Without Walls consortium that failed.

Unfortunately there is little to be said about the early admission program. There are no set guidelines for acceptance. It is more of a gut feeling on the part of the admission committee about a particular applicant who seeks to enter Skidmore at the end of the junior year of high school. As the catalogue says, "the Committee gives special consideration to the reasons for desiring such admission, the recommendation of secondary school guidance officials, and the ultimate potential for dealing with both the academic and cultural demands of college life." There seems to be no followup on how the early admit students do or what their problems may be. Indeed, no one knows who those students are once they're on campus unless the dean of students goes over to the admissions office and checks out the folders carefully. This, I fear, is the story of most early admission programs.

Full-Time Release Program

It is not the story with another Skidmore program, however, which has been going on for the past three years and is not even mentioned in the catalogue, the High School Senior Full-Time Release Program. It arose out of the college's more than ten years' experience with a series of seminars for five outstanding students from each of twelve area high schools. Because of the Carnegie Commission Report, *Less Time-More Options*, Skidmore decided to end both the seminar program and the one that had allowed a few superior high school seniors to take one course each semester during their senior year. In place of these, very good, highly-motivated seniors who had completed all or most of the requirements for the high school diploma are permitted to "make the transition from high school to college while still living at home and maintaining some degree of contact with their peer group." A student in this program may choose to live in a dormitory, but so far no one has. The college offers advising and some counseling services, but stresses the student's opportunity to maintain a social life at home.

There is a perfect match between the college and local school calendars, allowing just two days' transition, taken up with an

orientation session in which students talk with the dean of students and the registrar, who is their adviser. They then register, tour the library, meet with faculty over lunch, have another session with the dean of students when they are informed about which events and activities are open to them. Then they are on their own.

Students take a full load of four courses, all lower division. The registrar admits that they are afraid of sticking out like a sore thumb, but since all Skidmore courses are one semester courses, everyone is in the process of change, and apparently there is no real problem. The faculty do not know which students are in the release program any more than the students do. None of the students have said anything to Skidmore about not being fully accepted, although there are rumors that this is so. Counseling services are available, but there is no evidence that any of the early admission students have taken advantage of them.

The academic results are what one would expect. The average of the full-release students for the first two years was well above the average of the freshman class. In the first year, of a total 68 courses, there were no Ds or Fs and only 13 Cs. The record in following years, although not quite as good, gives the usual evidence of superior work.

The students, of course, receive a Skidmore transcript for their work and have been accepted with transfer credit to a number of excellent colleges. The cost to the student is $600 for the semester, and there is some scholarship aid.

Unfortunately, the numbers involved have dropped each year. As usual it seems to be because high school guidance counselors have an inner resistance to the plan. They say it causes problems for the students who have to take Regents Examinations for which they need high school courses. They also tell some potential students that they haven't completed the high school courses they need to take. This is palpably untrue under current New York State regulations, but it is difficult for students to know how to fight back.

The program is a well-conceived one. It makes the best of both worlds for the superior student in the Saratoga Springs area. It emphasizes to the student that the college cannot take responsibility for the social life for that semester but can add a cultural as well as academic dimension to the student's life at home and with friends at high school. The Skidmore one-semester course framework allows for maximum adaptability of a new student entering at midyear. The fact that all the students share the same adviser,

who is able to give all the right registration information and provide a kind of center in her office for the students adds an important personal element. The college also helps with tuition if necessary, does some college admissions counseling, and provides the services of career counseling and personal counseling from the regular college offices.

If there is a criticism it is that with this beginning, a more nearly complete program of high school-college articulation is surely possible. There is also a potential problem in the transferring of credit, although none of the students have informed Skidmore of any, and a rumor is not evidence. But as the student has only four one-semester courses to transfer, placement or credit for year long courses, such as freshman composition, at other colleges may be difficult to work out.

University Without Walls Experiment

The University Without Walls High School/College Program at Skidmore was a different matter. It was a real failure, and thus has many important lessons to teach. The plan was to see if the University Without Walls concept of individualized learning outside the normal academic structures would work for students who had basically completed their high school requirements but were not yet accepted at college. In other words, would the U.W.W. concept work for younger students? The answer, at least at Skidmore, was no. The basic problem was that college level work could not be developed for students who had had no experience either at college or in the outside world. As a result, students who had completed their high school requirements were often placed in independent study projects. Skidmore stuck to the U.W.W. plan and did not duplicate the Early Release Program, which although an honest approach, was not very helpful as far as the students were concerned. It must be remembered, however, that this was part of a nation-wide research grant from the Fund for Improvement of Post-Secondary Education.

There were 10 students and three faculty members involved in the project. The students volunteered, and they were a mixed group. Some lacked any real goals, others were definitely college bound. Some took college courses as well as doing independent work, some did four different independent projects, some took as many as three high school courses and one independent project for U.W.W. All received Skidmore-U.W.W. transcripts. Perhaps the most successful

case was a boy who did an internship at a local Y in social work and went on to a community college to take courses in recreation. The program had such a low profile it was practically invisible, and was discontinued after the first year.

Problems

There were several obvious reasons for the failure. First, the entire program was more a response to a grant proposal than an academic plan. A discouraging aspect of American education today is the amount of activity by colleges and consortia that place only secondary emphasis on real academic planning; the primary emphasis is to find some activity that will be supported by the government or a private foundation. I think that perhaps the only programs that should be funded are those whose sponsors are so convinced of their value that they will be tried in any case.

It was logical for Skidmore, already involved in U.W.W. and early release programming to take part. But the goals of the program were not clear, support money did not arrive until well into the academic year, and, more important than all the rest, this is not the age group to break loose from all social ties with their peers, put into independent work without experience or careful training, or free from all obvious forms of structure. Other branches of the U.W.W. High School/College Project claimed to be very successful, but the entire project was dropped after funding was withdrawn. It is a valuable lesson in how not to implement a program for late adolescents.

Separate Freshman Year Programs

Another way to handle early admission is to establish a separate program, unattached or only peripherally attached to a regular college program. A leading example of the first is the Freshman Year Program of the New School for Social Research, of the second, the Freshman Honors Program at the University of Delaware.

Freshman Year at the New School

The Freshman Year Program is designed primarily for students following either the tenth or eleventh grade, although it is also open to qualified high school graduates. Since the New School does not have a regular undergraduate program (it is just beginning an experimental seminar college for upper division work), students transfer to other colleges at the end of the year. The program was started in 1972 and is "specifically designed to provide an intellec-

tually stimulating and challenging first year of college. The faculty is specially selected and the curriculum is carefully developed to respond most effectively to the resources and needs of college freshmen. Courses are offered in the Natural Sciences, Mathematics, Social Sciences, Humanities, and Languages."

Although the program is essentially nonresidential (as are all programs at the New School), about one third of the students choose to live in New York University dorms, where they are housed together. The New School takes no responsibility for regulating their living arrangements. As one administrator put it: "We don't get involved in the students' behavior."

About one third of the students live in the city, another third commute from distances that require travel for more than an hour. The total enrollment has remained between 53 and 63. Between six and eight students enter after tenth grade, about the same after twelfth grade, but most enter after the eleventh grade. Very few enter in the second semester, although it is possible to do so. Dropouts, including those who fail academically, vary between six and eight per year.

The admission process is of central importance. An interview is required of each student, and that student is seen by two people. The basis of the interview is a short essay describing the applicant's intellectual growth and interests, as well as "a piece of writing done recently which you think is representative of your interests and abilities." In other words, the interview is substantive. The interviewers look for intellectual curiosity above all else. Not surprisingly, therefore, student SAT scores average between 600 and 625, although there are sometimes considerable differences. Once accepted, students are not tested except for the examinations given in each course as part of the academic work.

Each student elects four courses from a group of nine offered each semester (although substitutions can be made from intensive language courses offered on Saturday mornings or from other offerings by New School faculty). The courses meet twice a week for an hour and twenty minutes and range from those in Shakespeare and Joyce's *Ulysses* to calculus and the "Nature of Mathematics." Not surprisingly, many students take the biology-chemistry sequence and the physics-astronomy sequence. There is no special core course whose function is to integrate a student's program, but the students I talked to thought the biology course actually did that. Most of the students feel that the constant throughout all the

courses is the emphasis on modes of learning.

An example is the course in Joyce's *Ulysses*, perhaps an exotic choice for the first-year college work in literature, but sitting in on a class quickly convinced one critic. The goal of the course is to teach the students how to read a novel, and the use of one that is so difficult means that if a student can read that with understanding, he or she should be able to handle any other. The class discussion indicated not only that the approach was successful, but that the students were working at a high level.

There is no real attempt to create a social life for the students. One of the obvious benefits of the location is that the young students really take over the New School buildings during the day. The other students they meet tend to be older people who are involved in New School programs, and the mix of young and old is as successful as it is in other institutions.

The dormitory situation is difficult to get a handle on, first because the school pays little or no attention to it, and second because there is a mixed view among the students. Some feel at home and others feel a real lack of privacy. Some staff members believe that it must be very hard for some of the students but have no evidence that it is, and they do not look for any. By the second semester, however, the dormitory rooms tend to become the headquarters for the commuting students as well. In other words, as they get to know each other better, they create their own social center in the dormitory rooms of their fellow students as well as in the apartments of some of the students who live in town.

About 10 percent of the graduates do not go on to other colleges immediately, and, on the basis of the students with whom I talked, these tend to be the younger students who entered after the tenth grade. Some defer their transfer admissions and travel or work for a year or two to "find themselves." That supports statistics from other programs, as does the fact that about one third do not complete their undergraduate education in any one other institution.

Their New School transcript and record is readily transferable to almost any college in the country, and the list of institutions to which they have transferred is as impressive as would be expected from such a program and with such students.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The strength of this program lies in the quality of its faculty and of its coursework and in the maturity of the student body. It is an

early admission program for highly motivated students who are willing to commute or to live in a dormitory in a major city.

The weaknesses are also its strengths. Because of the lack of evaluation data about the students, it is difficult to judge how transportable the idea is. Nonresidency does away with many social worries, and a firm policy of not paying attention to the dormitory situation leaves any problems on that score unnoticed. The students seem genuinely content with how they are treated and what they are doing. When they compare their present situation with the high school programs they left behind, they are positively lyrical. But in many ways they exist between two worlds. Their schedules and work loads separate them from their high school group, and the time they spend at the New School is occupied with classwork, leaving little time to form close personal ties.

As an academic program for younger than normal students, the New School is one of the strongest of the various models for innovative high school-college articulation.

Delaware's Freshman Honors Program

Three years ago the Director of the Honors Program of the University of Delaware showed up at my office at Simon's Rock and talked about the hopes he had of setting up a quite special early admissions program at that institution. He had done his homework well and, knowing that we had been making studies of the younger-than-normal college student, wanted to get as much relevant material as possible for building his own program. Other visits by other members of his staff covered various elements of the Simon's Rock program, including housing, evaluation studies, social activities, etc. There was no doubt from the start that the program was going to be carefully thought through before their first students arrived on campus in September 1976.

From the beginning Delaware wanted to create a model program for other institutions to follow. For that reason it has instituted a full-scale evaluation program that will provide still further information about the nature of the early admission student and the late adolescent learner.

The program is designed for superior students. The median high school grade point average of the opening class of 150 was 3.6, the median verbal SAT score was 590 and mathematics, 670. Approximately 80 percent of the class ranked in the top 10 percent of their high school class. Although only 10 percent have finished high

school (almost all the rest finished eleventh grade), the average age is 17.5 which means that they are not really much younger than normal freshman entrants.

The curriculum offers both a sense of unity and a great deal of choice. All students take part in the honors forum, a series of outside speakers that includes people like Professor George Wald in biology and Professor Oscar Handlin in history. Seven colloquia are offered each semester, from which the student must choose one and may choose three. These are "interdisciplinary investigations of topics which force consideration of the relatedness of knowledge." As might be expected from what was said earlier in this book about "necessary failures," the colloquia do not work. The rest of a student's program is made up of honors courses (which are highly disciplinary) and independent study. Since most of the students are interested in medicine, science, and engineering, it is natural that they choose as many honors courses as possible. Since there are no required courses except the forum, an important part of the educational process is in the working out of a coherent program with a faculty adviser.

The faculty is made up of two groups: the "core faculty," who do advising as well as teaching in the honors program, and the "visiting faculty," who are on a year released time assignment from their usual duties on the main campus. There are also four graduate students who act as dormitory counselors and have some teaching assistant duties.

In seeking to maintain the identity of the program and to symbolize the integral nature of the year's work, the university decided to separate it from the main campus. Unfortunately, perhaps, in the absence of university space, it was moved to the campus and into the dormitories of Wesley College, a small denominational junior college in Dover, Delaware, 35 miles from the main campus. The move achieved its main purposes, but at the same time created all the problems one might have predicted: transportation hassles, conflicts between the two student bodies, disagreements about social regulations, awkward library problems, and stresses for the student affairs coordinator and the dormitory counselors. But these are perhaps not as important, as the fact that a strong sense of community and a cohesive faculty have developed.

Except for the colloquia, the program seems to have lived up to everyone's expectation. There, the problem seems two-fold. The first part is a matter of pedagogy. The faculty are not used to that

kind of format and have not adapted their teaching styles to its needs. The second appears to be the strongly vocational interest of the students. They want to get on with their specializations and foresee years of graduate study ahead. One hopes that the faculty will see the colloquia as the "necessary failure," and keep working at them.

In general, faculty members are working well and hard, but there is the usual split between those who hold office hours regularly, stay overnight in Dover occasionally, and really get involved, and those who just do what is required.

The success of the program seems largely a result of the efforts of the dormitory counselors who have obviously sacrificed their own graduate work to the needs of the students. They provided the social centers for the program in their own quarters and offices. The students use the counselors' kitchen to prepare their own dinners for fun, and the student activities staff talked the university into reorganizing the central offices of the program to provide a student lounge. Not only do the students who find it hard to make friends now have a place to gather, but the whole student body now takes advantage of the pool table, TV, and so on. If anyone doubts the importance of a social center for any early admission program, they should study the effect of this one room on a group of 150 young people.

The students are obviously unhappy about the Wesley College parietals: 11:45 p.m. during the week and 1:00 a.m. on weekends. They feel that the restrictions keep them from exercising their maturity. From this outside observer's point of view it has saved the program. For example, the counselors are not hearing any complaints from the parents of the students. The only social problem is alcohol, which is legal in Delaware in a person's own domicile, hence a dorm room.

One sign of the program's success is that by the end of the first term only eight students had left, and they had transferred to other colleges, including the main campus at Newark. All were high school graduates. There is some talk about increasing the number of high school graduates in following years, which would seem, on the face of other evidence, to be a mistake, perhaps even the first stage in the destruction of the whole program.

As might be expected, the level of enthusiasm for the program is extremely high among students, faculty, staff, and the whole university. All claim student response unlike any other in the country.

That is as it should be, even though the same claim is made by almost every well organized early admission program. In an age of apathetic college students and high school seniors, it is an inexplicable wonder to me that more institutions do not take advantage of the excitement and enthusiasm engendered by letting 16- and 17-year-olds move ahead to college work.

Warning Signals

The pros and cons of Delaware's program should be apparent. But perhaps a few warnings are appropriate, as it reaches the end of its first year. The second year of any program is usually the most difficult. There is always the temptation to drop elements, like the colloquia, that were well-thought-out but met with less than initial success, rather than to try to improve them. The staff living in Dover carry heavy work loads, and care must be taken to help them in every way—to provide encouragement, support, and satisfactory reimbursement. Greater care will be needed in replacing faculty than in choosing the first teachers. Careful study of the kinds of students chosen should reveal information for later recruiting. Students moving onto the main campus for the sophomore year should be given an opportunity to continue associations with each other and with the new group of freshmen.

Perhaps most important is the need to keep everyone involved in the program aware that they will necessarily repeat the same pattern of basic problems, the same basic needs for looking at the program anew each year. The students will all be coming to the program for the first time, and the faculty and staff must react to them with the same freshness and understanding as they did to the first students. It is a difficult task, but the program is already sufficiently successful to warrant the added attention. It is, indeed, a real model for others to follow.

Planning an Early Admission Program

An early admission program within a traditional college framework requires clear guidelines if it is to be successful for both the college and the student. The first choice that has to be made is whether the college is prepared to take all the necessary steps that a residential program for early admits entails. If it is not, then the program is immediately limited to students within commuting distance, and careful understanding must be established with all of the secondary schools in the area. Otherwise, the high school faculty and guidance

personnel can more or less kill the program simply by not recommending it or by refusing to pass on information to potential students.

A Nonresidential Program

There should be detailed information about the program, the admission process, admission standards, and support services offered by the college. Twenty-five years of varying experiences indicate that only academically above average students should be accepted. The Ford guideline establishes a very safe limit. All early admits should probably be above the average levels of a freshman class in the admitting college. Of course every early admission student should be interviewed on campus, and some judgment should be made about the maturity of the student for handling the work load and the social context of the college.

There needs to be a careful and extensive orientation program that will give the young students a realistic introduction to the college, the faculty's academic expectations, activities open to the students, and available counseling services. If possible, early admission students should all have the same adviser whose office should also serve as an informal meeting place. In nonresidential situations, it is probably best not to set these students apart as a group by providing a special lounge for them. But there should be a place where they can find each other informally in a natural way.

One of the functions of the faculty adviser is college advising. No pressure should be brought to bear on this group of students to continue at the college. If the college does its job well, a number of students may continue anyway. But since they are living at home for the year, they may still want to go away to college, and there should be no pressure against that. If parents and guidance personnel see the program as a recruiting device, they will withdraw their support. Many of these students will want career counseling, and the services of that college office as well as other counseling offices, health clinics, and so on, should be open to them. If a college does not have a counseling staff, it should probably not get involved in early admissions. Such an hiatus in the administration indicates a different attitude toward students from that required in dealing with early admits. In the same vein, the adviser should try to steer these students into courses and course sections taught by faculty who have an interest in the student as an individual.

A Residential Program

If the decision is to make an early admissions program residential, a whole new set of activities is required. Not only should the higher academic standards for entry be maintained, but the importance of the personal interview on campus is heightened. Admissions officers should contact their counterparts at other institutions that have early admission students and discover what personality traits they should be looking for as a test of maturity for successful college performance.

At this point a strong caveat is entered. Any college seriously undertaking early admission programs of any kind should set up a testing and evaluation program—both for the students and for the college—that will provide the necessary information to show how the students are doing. The students should be compared to the regular entrance students as well as to each other. They should be tested for maturity as well as academic ability. No college can insure success for any entering student, but it can choose students for whom the odds are high. There are still many unanswered questions about college for younger students. For example, at what level or percentage does a group of younger students change an entering class into a normal class that is simply a year younger than in the past—or does that ever happen?

Once on campus not only is a thorough going orientation program necessary, but it should probably extend through the first semester. The more participation by faculty in this activity, the better, for the students will learn very quickly that on a college campus, it is the faculty's opinion that really matters, not the administration's.

For the same reason the early admission students' advisers should be faculty members who are chosen very carefully for their willingness and ability to deal with younger students. If there are not enough faculty members with these qualities to do the advising, the college should not begin a residential early admission program because it just won't succeed.

The problems of housing and social regulations are the real headache but also the real benefit of an early admission program. Any college that still has late 1950s or early 1960s regulations is probably better off putting early admission students in with regular freshmen (but not with upperclass students). The rules I refer to include single sex dorms (at least by floor), limited parietals (11:00 p.m. on weekdays and 1 or 2 a.m. on weekends, for example), drug

136

and alcohol regulations (enforced, not just on the books), and quiet hours that permit studying in the dorms and getting to bed fairly early (younger students really do need more sleep, and pick up colds and other infections more quickly).

Colleges (and I believe they are in the majority now) that in effect have no rules should find a way to house the younger students so that there are regulations without fanfare. Part of the orientation can be used to explain the differentiation for the first year. There will be a number of complaints—there is no way around that—but in the long run the problems will not be as great for the college or for the students.

Dormitory supervision seems to work best with an adult (preferably a faculty member) head resident and student resident assistants. This provides both an adult role model—particularly important at this age—and a slightly older peer to help in adjusting to the college community.

A residential early admission program has an even greater need for counseling services in the college than the nonresidential, but it does not need to be so concerned about college and career counseling. The services offered to the rest of the student body should suffice. Early admission in this case is simply that. If a student transfers, that is his or her business. Since that is true, the residential program can also be opened to students leaving the tenth grade as well as the eleventh, but only if those students really give evidence of wanting to do the full undergraduate program at that college. A college would probably be well advised to take the admissions program one step at a time. My personal advice is to set a floor for entry at 16.

Academic Guidelines

On the academic side there are a few guidelines that any college would be well advised to consider. First, if the college has a well integrated freshman program, even if it is merely an elective or is open to one special branch of the college, it would appear to be a good idea to put the early admission students in it. It is probably not a good idea to develop a curriculum especially for early admission students, as that sets them further apart.

As mentioned frequently already, two elements of training seem to be important for the age group: interdisciplinary study and independent (or guided) study. If there are interdisciplinary courses available to freshmen, an adviser should get the early admit into

one. Sometime near the end of the freshman year the early admission student ought to be given the opportunity to do real independent study with strong guidance. The manner in which that is accomplished obviously depends on the curriculum of the particular college.

As a personal note, I urge colleges with short winter terms to consider shifting those terms to the end of the year, thus allowing for genuine independent study opportunities for all first-year students.

Simply from an administrative point of view, the nonresidential early admissions program offers fewer headaches. But for colleges that want to see an impressive growth in individual students, to have on campus a group that will raise overall academic performance levels, a residential early admissions program is an almost certain way of accomplishing this.

Separated Programs: Utilizing the University College or Extension Division

Anyone interested in using the New School program as a model for another institution is best advised to contact the Director of the Freshman Year. The situation at the New School is unique, but there are parallels that might be fruitfully considered. On most university campuses the counterpart of the New School is the university college or continuing education program. Here would be the same kind of faculty, headquarters, and classroom space (often underutilized during the day) adapted to the special needs of special students, and unhampered by traditional programs from developing a special set of courses that would most benefit the young students.

Perhaps central to the New School model is the development of disciplinary as well as interdisciplinary courses that stress modes of inquiry, not at the expense of imparting information but in order to provide training in handling basic facts in a specific field of learning. Faculty members should be as interested in students as persons as they are in communicating knowledge. The students' enthusiam will help to make up for the fact that the faculty may not be taking them on to higher levels of coursework.

On the social side, once again the real decision is whether or not to have a residential component. The easy way out is simply to keep it nonresidential. In a nonresidential arrangement, there should be a greater attempt to establish a place as a center for the

students' social life. This will probably not require any more than is supplied for a university college program. If that center can provide for social gatherings, preferably informal and daily, with the faculty, so much the better. The presence of older-than-usual students should be encouraged if that can happen naturally.

Academic advising can be relatively slight if the number of offerings is kept down, but college advising will be absolutely necessary, and, once again, should avoid any taint of appearing to be recruiting for the college itself.

Well organized, and carefully considered and implemented, the New School model attached to a university college or continuing education center could well be the fastest growing and most useful form of early admission program for larger colleges and universities across the country. It provides one of the best ways for students to achieve academic maturity while avoiding the social problems attendant on late adolescence.

The Honors Program Model

The Delaware Freshman Honors Program was established as a model for others to follow. As a result, any college can easily get all the necessary materials for planning its program by writing to the Director of Freshman Honors Program, either on the Newark campus of the university or on the Wesley College campus.

The basic elements of the program are the selection of superior students (it will be interesting to see how the students in the lower SAT ranges do both during the freshman year and for the remaining three years at Newark), the selection of faculty and staff, the separation of the program from the main campus, and the construction of an academic program that provides each student a maximum of choice, with a necessary spread of experience that includes interdisciplinary and highly disciplinary courses as well as independent study. Still to be worked out is a way to nullify the unfortunate effect of the student's attending three institutions in three years (high school, the honors program, and the University of Delaware or another college).

I suspect that the Delaware Program has higher requirements for entry than is really necessary. Mid-to-high 500s on SATs provide sufficient evidence of students' ability to do well in an early admission program, especially if accompanied by good marks in secondary school. There is no doubt that the "honors" tag has two practical benefits, and possibly three. It helps to recruit students because it

appeals to the pride of potential applicants and of their parents; it makes it easier to find regular faculty members willing to take off from their regular teaching duties for a short period to participate in the program; and it probably means that the great majority of applicants will be from the sciences and engineering and will not create as many social problems as do their peers in the humanities and social sciences. (There is, of course, a real difference between the two groups.)

Recruiting Problems

A word is called for about recruiting for special early entrance programs. It is extremely difficult and requires modifications of the usual techniques. As guidance counselors are not prepared to handle tenth and eleventh graders for college counseling, it is necessary to go direct to the students. College fairs and college nights become the main visiting activity of admission staffs. Once students are in the program, they and their parents become the best recruiters and should be used as much as possible, especially for parties to which their former school friends and acquaintances are invited. Independent school students must be handled with great care, and any appearance of "raiding" must be avoided, or the college will find its supply of regular applicants from those schools drying up quickly. Recruiters must recognize that college counselors in independent schools play a much larger role in students' choices than do their counterparts in public schools.

The Student Search Service of the College Board can provide lists of potential tenth and eleventh grade students in any category or subdivision a college wishes, but the costs are considerably higher than for the usual listings. As more institutions ask for the earlier lists, costs should go down. Actually, the more institutions that use those lists, the more effective they will be, as the recipients of the mailings will discover how widespread the opportunities for early admission are. Unfortunately, the lists come late in the year (although a tenth grade list in the late spring becomes a valuable source of eleventh grade names in the early fall).

The timing of choice for early admission is the real headache in recruiting. A college simply has to face the fact that as many as half the applicants will come in after June 1. They simply do not consider the college choice, in general, until they finish tenth or eleventh grade and begin to think of the educational wasteland that lies immediately ahead of them. Productive recruiting begins

140

at about the time that most traditional recruiting comes to an end.

Another observation is worth making: these students do not appear to be taken in by slick advertising. They want to see what the program looks like, what courses are offered (with full course descriptions). Obviously, brochures should be attractive, but the real effort should be put into the text, not the design. An approach of this type also tells the parents that the program is a serious academic one, not a recruiting ploy.

Faculty Selection

Wise selection of faculty is one of the keys to success. Not only must faculty members know their subject matter well, they must also be willing to question their own pedagogical methods in the light of the kind of students they are handling. I do not, by that, mean that they should lower the level of their courses. But they must find ways to get the students involved more quickly; they must be willing to guide students into independence with care but with the appearance of holding back. Young students will have had less experience with long papers, with choosing valid topics for papers, with narrowing research topics. Faculty who simply react negatively to these needs will do more harm than good.

There is real validity in bringing some faculty from the upper division courses into the program, not only to spread the word of the competence of the students but also to act as personal contacts later on for students in the freshman program.

Just as important as the faculty, and perhaps even more important, are members of the support staff. They will have to bear the brunt of the social adaptation of the students, and this tends to become a 24 hour job. For that reason the staff should not only be a caring one but also made up of individuals who withdraw at times—to preserve their own sanity. If at all possible, staff members should also teach. Faculty with released time are probably the best answer, but at the very least the dorm counselors should have clear and high-profile teaching assistant duties. Otherwise, the important message that a college education involves the whole person will be lost.

Physical Separation

The separation of the program from the main campus is not easy to achieve. A college that has a smaller campus nearby can solve the problem easily enough, but on a single campus a special area for

the freshman program may have to be set aside. If a separate campus is used, it should be close enough to the main campus for the students to take advantage of the college's cultural events, the main library, and the other elements that make up a genuine college experience. If it is too close, however, the program may become a subject of ridicule.

A clear relationship to the main campus is the only way to eliminate the feeling students have of attending three different institutions in three successive years, a situation to be avoided, if possible, because it creates a tendency in students to keep transferring from one institution to another in later years.

Enough has already been said about the importance of an academic program for this age group of both interdisciplinary work and independent study to belabor the point further. It needs only the additional comment that these students need and want to get on with their special interests. Locking them into a general education program rather than allowing them to get their feet wet in specialized courses leading to a future major will only antagonize students who already know their educational goal.

The Middle College

The middle college concept is not new. It stems from at least the 1920s, as both Pasadena and Shimer illustrate. It was the original form of Simon's Rock, it was tried at La Guardia Community College, and is being implemented at several junior colleges around the country as well as being recommended for other institutions—for example, the proposed new school of the Winchester-Thurston School at Carnegie-Mellon. Despite the strong rational base for its existence, the ease with which it can be established, and its adaptability to both public and private institutions, it has not had a good survival record. A close look at several examples will help to explain both the model's strengths and the potential causes of its destruction.

Pasadena Junior College

The simplest model is that in which grades 13 and 14 are added to the high school years, usually with the gradual elimination of grades nine and ten. A peer group of 16 to 20 is established; class scheduling and rules are adopted that resemble those of college instead of high school. Teachers are involved in all the four years, bringing higher academic standards to the lower classes and greater personal attention to the upper ones. In Pasadena there were basically no residential problems to deal with because of the commuter student population. The academic goal was to complete the basic liberal education of the students before they entered the specialization of the last two years of college. No attempt was made to accelerate a student and the only way acceleration could occur was for a student to take a heavy overload along the way. There were a few courses that were developed especially for the program, emphasizing modes of inquiry, but in general the chief academic value was the opening up of a wide range of college level courses for those students who were still in grades 11 and 12. When they transferred to the junior year at university, they were particularly well prepared, having really been treated as college students for four years.

The reasons for the ending of the program have been mentioned earlier: the school districts were restructured, and secondary school and junior college jurisdictions no longer meshed; parents felt that since other schools did not adopt the program, there must be something wrong with it; the traditionalists had always been opposed to it simply because it was different; many parents did not like the idea of their 16-year-old children having college freedoms in class-

room scheduling, homework, and so on; and no satisfactory solution had ever been found for the athletic schedule being out of phase with both high schools and colleges.

But underlying all the arguments on both sides was a recognition of one very positive maturing factor: eleventh and twelfth graders were doing their work on a college campus and were reacting positively to the situation.

Shimer and Simon's Rock

Although Shimer College has been around for 125 years and Simon's Rock for only about ten, the establishment and then the abandonment of the middle college concept at the two institutions followed similar lines. There was the initial stage in which at least organizationally and in the awarding of the high school diploma and associate degree there was an apparent division between the first two and last two years, even though the same faculty taught throughout the program. Entry level depended on the grade level at which a student left high school, which reinforced the idea that the first two years were in some way parallel to high school. In both cases the institution set out to fulfill the traditional goals of a liberal arts education preparatory to academic specialization or a job. Shimer incorporated a highly-structured general education program based on ideas from the University of Chicago; Simon's Rock adopted the elective model with strong advising. The result was much the same: each college recognized the fact that the 16-20 group was ready for college work, could do extremely well in college courses, and was indeed doing a four-year college program at the institution. It made no sense to give only an A.A. for that work. Moreover, in both cases the student was unable to accelerate without a heavy overload, yet other colleges recognized the value of the education and gave students advanced credit on transfer. The imbalance, unfairness, and financial strain were all too clear. Both moved to the awarding of a B.A. degree in four years. The major difference was that Shimer became predominantly an 18-22 age group with a large early admission program, whereas Simon's Rock remained a four-year program for the 16-20 peer group.

As they are residential institutions both colleges had to deal with problems of social life. Shimer was fortunate in being a middle college when social regulations were strict, when 21 was still the legal age for adults, and apparently there were few strains. Simon's Rock came into existence just as college regulations of all kinds

began to fall apart and has had to spend an inordinate amount of time working on the guidelines for social rules and behavior. Half the students became legal adults when the voting and drinking age was dropped to 18.

Both experienced the genuine values of the 16-20 peer group taught by faculty that enjoyed working with the age. The Shimer situation in the late 40s had the added benefit of being made up mainly of faculty who had taught at other colleges. During Simon's Rock's middle college years most of the faculty only had secondary school teaching experience, and that created certain questions of self-image.

In each case the success of the middle college experience, joined with the problem of attrition (not in the bad sense of dropping out but in the good sense of transferring to other colleges) caused the institution to move on to offering the B.A. instead of the A.A. for the four year experience. As private institutions, the colleges were hurt by the loss of tuition from the high rate of transfer. A four year institution cannot afford the luxury of having a student body that basically stays only one or two years.

Yet in spite of the final action of these colleges, there does seem to me to be a genuine place for the middle college, and we will deal with that idea after looking at another institution that tried a middle college.

La Guardia Community College

In September 1974 the first class of students entered a new unit of La Guardia Community College called the Middle College. The planning for this new unit had been going on for two years under a grant from Carnegie Corporation, and the model that had evolved was significantly different from any of the others discussed in this book. First, it consciously covered a five year rather than a four year span, starting at rather than after the tenth grade. Second, instead of working with better-than-average students, this plan was designed for students with genuine learning problems. The program was to match that of other high schools in the area and that of La Guardia Community College, which meant that it would be vocationally oriented at the same time that it tried to train the students in basic skills in reading, writing, mathematics, and social studies. As one early position paper put it, if the program worked, the students, by the time they earned the A.A., would have attained twelfth grade basic skills (80 percent of incoming La Guardia stu-

dents need remedial work on entering the junior college program, and the situation is worsening).

There were a number of basic premises to the program: career education would be emphasized in all activities, entry to college would be guaranteed when the student entered tenth grade, students in the first three years would be housed on the college campus to provide more motivation for the students, basic skills would be incorporated in all courses, college courses would be offered the students with advanced skills, there would be a joint high school-college faculty, the curriculum would be designed on a continuous five year sequence, interdisciplinary instruction would be used in some areas, and teaching and counseling would be combined for the faculty. And going along with the program would be an intensive evaluation and testing program.

I had followed the La Guardia planning carefully since 1972. It was a considerable shock to visit the college this year and find that in fact the Middle College does not exist. What does exist is a three-year high school on a community college campus. The short history of the operation is important in this study of high school-college articulation, however, as it points out problems that need to be avoided in middle college planning.

To begin with, it is both a victim and a survivor of state educational divisions. Funded by the board of education because of the high school part, it was under the governance of the Regents because the terminal degree was the A.A. On the plus side, that division saved the school, since almost as the doors opened, the financial crisis hit both the city of New York and the state. Had the funding been in higher education, the program would certainly have been dropped, as was the highly successful Allen Center in Albany. On the negative side, the high school operation falls under all the problems of union shop rules of New York secondary education. The kind of faculty discussions, conferences, seminars, and planning sessions that an academic program of this kind requires simply can't be achieved on union hours, unless the classroom situation is sacrificed.

It is difficult to determine which parts of the program began to fall apart first. The interdisciplinary courses were dropped immediately and replaced by traditional tenth grade courses. Motivation was to be the clue to the success of the whole program, but attendance was very poor (and became attrition the second year), the hoped-for growth in basic skills did not take place (in mathematics

the curve deflected downward), college faculty members, with rare exceptions, did not take part in the high school course sequence, the high school group basically remained encapsulated on the campus and the projected mix of students did not occur; students remained as unsure of their vocational goals as when they entered the program.

One of the primary problems undoubtedly resulted from the decision not only to avoid picking better-than-average applicants for the first class but to choose those with greater than average academic problems. In the second year, a stronger group of students was selected, and the results were considerably better.

Although the Middle College does not really exist, real benefits are beginning to appear. A few students are already taking junior college courses and getting a head start on higher education. The location of the school on the college's campus seems to affect positively the younger students' behavior. Student pride in the program is beginning to appear. And if total acceptance of the school by the college faculty and students as a whole is a long way off, at least new and better attitudes are developing.

If there is an overriding observation to be made by an outside observer, it is that organizationally a middle college must be under one jurisdiction, and academic planning and faculty participation must be achieved within a college rather than a high school framework. I also think that evidence points to the need to implement any middle college model with better-than-average students and to the recognition that student motivation is an internal quality, not a result of structure.

Middle College Models

Despite many of the negative results of plans for middle colleges it still seems to me that the concept is not only workable but it is possibly the most fruitful of the models for a great many schools, public and private. It also seems to be the model that permits very good secondary schools to provide the general education training commonly offered in the first two years of college.

The caveats are clear. Unless the middle college makes provision for the acceleration of students (not the necessity for that acceleration), it will not survive. There is a genuine danger in including the tenth grade (except in special cases like Matteo Ricci College, to be examined later) in the middle college format because that introduces a group of students who are still not in the 16-20 peer group.

The faculty must believe that the work of the middle college is college level rather than either an extension of high school or an ambiguous blend. And—the most difficult part—the students must feel that they are being treated as college students.

Model One—The Junior College Base

There are three basic models for the middle college. The first is the establishment on a junior college campus of the two years of classes that normally would be referred to as grades 11 and 12. A sequential plan of courses would then be established that allowed students to move ahead at their own best speed. Teachers should be required to teach at all levels so that the unity of the program can be emphasized and so that the faculty can gain a sense of the abilities of the younger students. Roadblock obstructions to a student's progress must be eliminated. For example, if the faculty agree that a laboratory science should be required, a bright student should be placed in a course whose level is as high as he can handle. Once that is passed, another science should not be required in order to slow down his progress.

Achievement goals should be established in the various academic areas so that specific numbers of units should not be used as a barrier to the completion (nor as an easy out, either) of requirements. Prerequisite courses should be established only where the need is palpable. We are talking about general education goals in a middle college, not the needs of upper division majors. Some students will want to take all the possible courses offered by the institution and not accelerate. Others will want to complete their A.A. requirements quickly and get on to university. The curriculum should allow for both types of students.

Students should be treated the same at all levels or the sense of unity of the middle college will be lost. There will always be some parental unhappiness with the arrangement, but the quality of the program should be sufficiently high to convince those parents of the overriding benefits. This whole problem is one of the principal reasons for not including tenth grade in the plan.

To underestimate the importance of athletics would be a great mistake. Someone must be given the responsibility for developing a sports schedule that leads to fair competition with other institutions, and discussions with the National Collegiate Athletic Association are probably a necessity. Again, I am not sufficiently acquainted with the whole area to make any specific suggestions. I do

know, however, that it is a problem that must be attacked and solved.

A junior college would be well advised to search out highly qualified high school teachers to add to its staff. Teaching experience with younger students would be of benefit to the entire faculty, and would tend to keep everyone honest about student abilities, problems, and attitudes. But those teachers should be involved at all levels of instruction. And all faculty members should realize the importance of undertaking teaching and advising functions rather than delegating that responsibility to guidance offices. In every way, the framework should be a college framework.

In such a structure, very bright students might be capable of completing the work for the A.A. in two years but they would be well advised to remain for three.

Most students should be able to gain the A.A. in three years, at least if there is some selectivity in the admission process. And there should be such selectivity if the program is to work fully. Normal entrance for other students after the twelfth grade is perfectly possible under such a plan, and there should be no conflict if the program is structured intelligently.

High School Diploma

Unfortunately, some rationale for the awarding of the high school diploma must be worked out. It should not, however, be based on two years (or one year in the case of those entering after eleventh grade elsewhere) of coursework. If it is, transfer credits to other institutions will be extremely difficult to establish. For example, no matter what the middle college says about its coursework, if the diploma is awarded at the end of the second year, many colleges will only give transfer credit to courses in the third year. If the diploma is awarded for a certain number of credit hours, those same colleges will only award transfer credit to the number of credit hours in excess of the diploma requirements. This is simply a fact of American college life. The only way to avoid the situation otherwise is to label courses as high school or college, and once that happens, the middle college program is dead.

Model Two – Secondary School Base

The second model is the extension of a secondary school program into the middle college plan. Here at least two types have to be considered: the public high school and the private boarding school. In each case we will assume that the school currently contains

grades 9-12 and has a faculty that is capable of and probably already is teaching college level courses (AP courses, for example). We will also assume that there is or will shortly be extra classroom space that will allow for the new program, and that in the boarding school example some differentiation in housing is also possible.

The high school faces an immediate legal problem that forces the two-fold model. Otherwise I would suggest that both public and private institutions approach the plan the same way: add grade 13, extend the size of the college offerings in the twelfth grade, and award the A.A. to those students who could complete the two years of college work within the thirteenth year. I suspect, however, that a lawsuit would be brought almost immediately against a public school that did this which argued that if an A.A. was offered, it would have to be available to anyone who made passing grades in coursework. If I am wrong and there are public schools that can award diplomas and degrees selectively, I would recommend the second model. (A high school comprising only grades eleven and twelve should use the previous junior college model simply by adding two years and becoming a four-year middle college.)

Public Middle College

A high school that begins with grade nine is probably in a better position to add the middle college program than one that starts at grade 10. It provides a greater number of students that will keep alive the feeling of the "high school" as an entity and as an important factor in the growth of the students. The middle college should at best, in this situation, be a value-added program that should help heighten the whole educational program of the school. It must not be the tail that wags the dog. Everyone will be in the high school program; only some will go on to the middle college.

The middle college should be added a year at a time. It will be two years from the beginning that the first A.A. is given (and there will be screams of protest from one class of seniors who will not be part of the program unless they hold back a year) and three years before the full program is in place. That time is needed for working on the problems of degree-granting authority and accreditation standing, the upgrading of the library, and the addition of faculty with college teaching experience. We will come back to those three interrelated items later.

It seems ridiculous, but the present articulation standards require that the middle college following this model must fall back to

its sta..ing point. We are trapped on one hand by an outdated system of Carnegie Units and on the other by the honestly inadequate standards of the GED tests. There is no testing mechanism of any sort that really satisfactorily describes high school diploma standards. There is a reason, of course. If they were set, most graduating high school students would probably fail. So the only standards that are really available are AP and IB examinations, that set standards for the completion of the first year of college, and the various college courses available to the high schools.

The school has, it seems to me, one of two choices: either use the GED as a testing device for entry into the program (using, of course, the national standards for passing) or use AP or equivalent courses as the entry level courses and hope that students get at least a 2 on the examinations. Actually, there is an easy way to decide: both the state board of higher educati.. and the regional accreditation association should be consulted to see which would be acceptable to them. If the GED is not, then there is no question about how to proceed.

Although individual courses that are a part of the middle college program should be open to some eleventh graders, the program in its initial years should be structured so that grades 12 and 13 are its core, while grade 14 is for those who complete a full high school sequence before entering the A.A. program. During the first year, only students in grade twelve should be treated as part of the middle college. It will mean that a decision will be necessary concerning some students who want to get an A.A. under the new system but are just one year ahead of the inception of the program. My advice is to say no. Degree-granting authority and accreditation as well as acceptance by other colleges of transfer credit are involved, and the school must keep its standards clear and high.

Students entering the middle college in twelfth grade must understand that they are entering a full college schedule, not just one or two AP courses. It is unlikely that the school will be overwhelmed with applicants. The experience of the first year should not be used to foretell the future of the middle college. Ingrained attitudes of both students and parents need time for change. Naturally, entry into specific courses should not be limited to middle college students. The greater the academic mix of the regular group of high school students and those headed for the A.A., the better. Incidentally, graduation from high school and the awarding of the diploma will be a tricky problem. I suspect that official graduation in

those states where it is possible should be after passing the GED, but the actual awarding of the diploma should be with the student's own class (thus, in most cases, at the end of his or her first year of middle college).

The addition of grade 13 will bring the first of many problems. First, a group of older students will be present, including many who will resent any kind of regulation that smacks of high school. For students just starting on the A.A. after completing the twelfth grade, many classes will also include students two years younger. It will take a strong sense of a middle college identity to keep these two groups from taking verbal potshots at each other. Another problem will be that other students will want to return to work toward the A.A. but I would advise against this – the middle college should be defined by peer group (ages 16-20) as well as by academic degree. Otherwise both the high school and middle college programs will be torn apart by external pressures. If faculty members want to teach older students, let them go to a traditional college. No one should be allowed to lose sight of the needs and problems of the ninth and tenth grade students.

In the third year, grade 14 would be added, and the full range of possibilities for the student within the school system would be in place. By that time, some students should be well into the program by eleventh grade, perhaps even headed for the simultaneous awarding of the high school diploma and A.A. degree. Some students would not take any college courses until after the twelfth grade. Their added age may well help to make up for potential academic weaknesses. But if there is a genuine middle college at work, most of the students will have completed their A.A. by grade 13.

Social Problems

The real problems of establishing this model lie in the social milieu of the school. There has to be both unity and separateness of the programs. Academically, there should be no difficulty if the peer group is maintained and the teachers indicate that students of any class level are real and equal participants. Outside of class, several elements would appear to be necessary: a social center for the middle college, especially if there are smoking prohibitions for the high school; an absence of restrictions on remaining in the building, at least for those in grades 13 and 14, who may well have jobs on the side; a program of cultural events, speakers, films, art exhibits, and so on, that not only will help create a college atmosphere but add an

educational value for the whole school. And there should be a way for the middle college students to become involved in curriculum planning, evaluation, and other college activities.

Library, Faculty, and Accreditation

Three areas will require considerable attention in the college's early years.

Few high school libraries are adequate for the needs of students doing college work. Not only must the library grow in size, but purchasing for it must be done carefully, it must be staffed by professionals, and its services must be those of a college library, with special emphasis on interlibrary loans. No middle college can expect accreditation unless at least 5 percent of its budget is put into the library, and in the beginning years even more than that will be required.

The addition of some faculty members will likely be necessary, and these should have the qualifications and experience for teaching in a college. College curriculums, even at the general education level, must be developed carefully. Interdisciplinary courses and requirements of and provisions for independent study should also be college level.

Many decisions will have to be made on the basis of state board and regional accreditation committees' reactions, unfortunately. Not to start with that realization would be unrealistic. Any middle college model will require a strong evaluation system. The model will have to prove it achieves what it says it achieves. Standardized tests should be used to show entry and exit levels. Studies of the makeup of the student body will help. (If every group working with this age group would use the Loevinger, Kohlberg, or Perry maturity scales, we would quickly learn a great deal about the real relationship of maturity to age and academic ability.) Followup on graduates, especially their transfer records, will be essential. Curriculums need to be formulated that are parallel to those of other colleges.

And any school moving into a middle college plan will find itself under attack by both junior colleges (who are already on the defensive after ten years of very rapid growth) and regular four year colleges.

A Boarding School Middle College

The independent boarding school that wants to add a middle college program has significantly greater problems but also offers greater benefits. In the first place, it ought to require only the addition of grade thirteen, and most larger independent schools already have a postgraduate year. If the school is large enough to consider adding a middle college, it may already have a fairly large and relevant library on which to build. If its reputation is good (and if it is not, it probably should not give even a second thought to the matter), there should be little question either at the state board of higher education level or at the regional accrediting level that the faculty and students are capable of college work. The school will probably already have experience and an established reputation from the use of AP courses and examinations. And most students will probably complete the first year of the middle college program at the twelfth grade and use the credits for transfer to the sophomore class in various colleges.

Benefits to the Boarding School

If that is the case, what are the benefits to the school? As tuition costs of boarding schools rise and the number of children per family drop, there will probably be a larger number of students attending independent schools but for shorter periods of time. Parents will want to give their children what they see as the added academic benefits of a private school education but will not feel they can afford a long stay there. A school with a middle college program could offer the following options: the traditional four-year program with entry into college following twelfth grade, perhaps either with advanced placement in some courses or advanced standing as a sophomore; a three-year (or two-year, if the student entered at the tenth grade following a middle school education elsewhere) program leading to a high school diploma if the student did well enough to meet the school's clearly-defined standards for the diploma; a four-year program that included the first year of the middle college and led to transfer to the sophomore year at another college (or three years to the same point on entry to the tenth grade); a five-year (or four-year from tenth grade) program to the A.A. degree, leading to a transfer to the junior year elsewhere; an entry to a one-year college program on graduation from another school. Obviously there are other variations, but they all share one important quality: the

first year or two of college work, done at least one year early as far as a student's age is concerned, is completed within the social framework of an independent school rather than on a college campus.

Social Regulations

But a middle college student, especially in the thirteenth year, simply cannot—or should not, anyway—be treated in the same way as a ninth grade student. If it is decidedly unwise, or immoral, or whatever, to send off a younger-than-normal student into the ruleless anarchy of American college life these days—and this is what most independent school faculty and administrators I have talked to really feel—then it is even more so to continue to treat these students as children for a longer period of time and then throw them in with upperclassmen. At least at 16 or 17 they are part of the same peer group as regular freshmen. At 17 or 18 they are in a different grouping from the 21- and 22-year-olds.

So there must be more freedom joined with more responsibility for the middle college student. If there is a possible separation of housing space, as in a separate but contiguous area, I would recommend that solution, at the same time offering every possible inducement, honorary or financial, to have the older students voluntarily assume resident assistant roles in the lower class dormitories. At the very least a social center that allowed for the separation of drinking regulations (in states where that difference applies) or for a place where final year students could "get away from the kids" would probably be a necessity. I am not proposing a separate set of rules and regulations, but there might well be different levels of interpretation. It is impossible to be specific in recommendations when the independent schools vary so widely. My point is that differences in handling 18-, and in some cases 19-year-olds, from 14-year-olds are necessary at the same time that it is necessary to retain a sense of total community. As these problems are worked out, the middle college students should be brought into all discussions and treated with maturity and respect.

Enough has been said about middle college academic programs to bypass that issue here. The critical point for the boarding school will be the decision on high school diploma standards. They are going to have to be clear enough and acceptable enough for those colleges to which the graduates of the school have always wanted to go to agree to abide by them. Otherwise the program will never get off the ground. Also, the faculty is going to have to learn to treat

the middle college students differently, to give them a freer hand, a sense of independent judgment, a willingness to bring their lives to their work. It is frankly this part of the model that gives me, as a college teacher, the most concern.

The Self-Contained Middle College

The third model is the self-contained middle college. My own opinion is that all of the cited examples have changed into different kinds of institutions because they were constructed on a four-year base rather than a three-year base. The goal should remain, as indicated in the Four School Study, to base the institution on the peer group of 16-20, but the able student should be able to complete the A.A. in three years following the tenth grade or attrition will always lead to a change. That does not mean that some—or many—students may not take four years. But it does mean that it should not be necessary for a student to take a heavy overload in order to achieve graduation in three.

Attention Span

One quality of younger-than-normal college students has not been discussed so far but has very real implications concerning courseload. On the basis of Simon's Rock experience, it would seem that these students have little desire to carry fewer courses than five at a time. In fact, given a chance, they will opt for six or seven courses. Moreover, heavy courseloads do not appear to make any significant difference in performance. Forcing a student to take fewer courses does not have the same qualitative advantages it has in later years. All this is true despite the clear success of a short-term experience once a year of a highly concentrated independent study project. Thus, a normal load of five courses seems the appropriate average load for early or middle college students.

Since the entire program should clearly be at a college level, it must develop an educational rationale for the necessity of completing three years instead of two for the A.A.; since it begins following the tenth grade, it must develop an equally arguable rationale for taking only three years instead of four. Because to survive economically it will need to allow students to enter following the tenth, eleventh, or twelfth grades, it will need to develop a rationale as to why an A.A. can be earned by some students in only two years. It is likely, therefore, that a combination of entry level, curricular requirements, and credit hours will be necessary.

This model provides the easiest format for a well-structured general education of the Shimer kind, but any curriculum for this age group will require a considerable range of electives from which to choose if it is to be successful in drawing students.

Social regulations must be stronger and clearer than at most colleges, but not as strict as at boarding schools. Let no one be foolish enough to believe they can solve some of the problems by making this model a single-sex college. No institution can be successful with this peer group unless it is coeducational.

In spite of past history, can this model be a success simply as a middle college? I think the answer is "yes," but in the end it will depend on the faculty. If the program is very successful, they will want to do more than offer the A.A., and the middle college will turn into an early college. There is certainly nothing wrong with that. But there is a role for the middle college as such. The faculty must be chosen with care. Teachers with experience in both secondary and collegiate institutions would be most suitable. The Ph.D. should not be a requirement, nor should published research. Teachers with high academic standards and a genuine love of young people are the goal. They need to know how colleges operate, but they should not want to duplicate their own graduate school.

Playing the role of a feeder institution into the upper division of several colleges would probably be a good thing financially and programmatically. But a close association with any one college should probably be avoided. As enrollments drop, no college will be able to avoid competing with another simply because the graduates of the other transfer into its junior year.

One variation on this model has not been tried, and it should be: the nonresidential urban middle college. La Guardia's project had too many variables to be a real test case. But the comparative growth of the day school and the decline of the boarding school would argue for the possible success of a private middle college in an urban setting.

The Early College

The basic logic of most arguments for new articulation procedures between high school and college leads to the early college concept, an institution based on the 16-20 peer group that allows a student to move at his or her best speed toward a completion of the liberal education that is the basis for graduate school or for a career in the outside world. One model, Simon's Rock, has already been dealt with at some length. Two others deserve study, one no longer in existence, the other still halfway through its first complete sequence.

The Allen Center

The demise of the James E. Allen Collegiate Center of SUNY-Albany can be attributed to a single cause: the financial crisis of the state of New York that led to reduction of support to the university. Once the decision on where to cut was placed in the university's hands, the decision was inevitable. No innovative program, especially one for early admission students, could compete with the demands of the graduate schools. So a highly successful program came to an end with the graduation of the first entering class.

The center had opened in July 1972, under the direction of Dean Seth Spellman, one of the planners of the academic program (described by Schick and Spellman in the November 1972 issue of *Intellect*). The first class entered that September. The curriculum was a core program in the social and behavioral sciences that originally took up 111 of the required 120 credit hours for graduation. When it became clear that as many as half the students would transfer to the main campus in order to pursue more individual interests, the core was cut back to about 69 credit hours. The title of the core, "Man and His Institutions," gives a good hint to its content and approach. Basically interdisciplinary in subject and approach, the core courses included subjects like humanities and the social order, science and society, and philosophy of social sciences. An integral part of the core was the internship program that sent students to various public and private organizations for specified periods of time each week to observe their day-to-day functioning. The center's location in the state capitol made possible a wide range of governmental internships. Independent study was also emphasized from the first year. Elective courses outside the core curriculum were offered both at the center and on the main campus. All the extracurricular activities of the university were open to the Allen Center students. Faculty members were young, bright, and com-

mitted to the program and the students. Faculty-student relationships were close without being chummy.

The original plan called for students to enter following the eleventh grade, and the financial savings to the state were not overlooked in developing and defending the center. During the first three years, it saved the state of New York $136,260 by admitting 253 students from public high school prior to their graduation. This was a net savings to the state after the cost of the center was included (students paid regular university tuition and fees). But the center was not able to get enough early admission applicants to run the program, so students were accepted after twelfth grade as well. Even with that change, enrollment was not what was either hoped for or projected. The goal was 400 new students each year, whereas the peak total enrollment was 350 students.

On the basis of four somewhat similar recruitment situations, the Allen Center, Simon's Rock, the New School, and the University of Delaware, it is possible to predict that 150 is about the top number of students that an early admission or early college program can hope to secure annually until more students and their parents begin to think of it as a natural and normal alternative.

Admissions practices were fairly standard. Students were chosen from the top fifth of their classes. The mean grade point average of the three entering classes rose from 86.2 in the first year to 88.8 in the last (the performance of Allen Center students was significantly higher than that of regular SUNY-Albany students in the classes they took together). But academic ability was only part of the admission requirement. Student interest and goal orientation as indicated by recommendations from high school teachers, guidance counselors, and community leaders, and an essay written by the applicant were also taken into consideration.

Most students lived on campus, and after the first year during which they were housed together, they were mixed with other university students. The center did not become involved in any disciplinary issues and felt there were no problems connected with the age of the students, which averaged in the high 17-year-old bracket on entry. However, the health center reported that more Allen Center students came to the counseling service than did other entering freshmen.

Attrition was, as usual, a mixed thing. Very few dropped out of higher education, but about 50 percent transferred into the regular university programs. Of the entering 61 first-year students, how-

ever, more than 33 graduated from the center in 1976, and all those who applied to graduate school were accepted.

From any point of view, the program was successful as an educational experiment. Even enrollment was successful when compared with the rest of the university campus but the only significant support from other parts of the university came from the School of Education, and as might be expected, it led to negative feedback.

Problems began when the state education department began an attack on some of the SUNY doctoral programs. Each branch of the university was then charged to determine which doctoral programs should be dropped; the charge was subsequently escalated to include all programs. With budgetary restrictions added at the same time, it was clear that something had to go and that the faculties were determined to maintain the graduate programs. The Allen Center was one of the first victims at Albany.

The Allen Center is an object lesson for any innovative program established within the framework of a larger institution. Without broad support within the institution, a program of this type cannot survive. If an early college program establishes its own admission system, it will compete with the institution's admission office. Yet if it depends on the regular admission office, it will of necessity receive only secondary attention.

These sets of conditions lead me to the conclusion that within a university the best place to put an innovative program for younger-than-normal students is within the continuing education structure. And a self-supporting economic base should be established as quickly as possible.

Matteo Ricci College

Another visitor to Simon's Rock in my early months there was Father William LeRoux, who was involved in a project study for a new educational venture joining the facilities of two Jesuit institutions in Seattle, Washington—the Seattle Preparatory School and Seattle University (SU). The goal was the creation of a six-year program that would replace the traditional eight years of high school and university. There is a historical precedent for this approach in Jesuit training, so the antagonism sometimes felt by traditional high school and college faculties for time-shortened programs was not a major factor. The program was divided into two forms, the first to utilize the preparatory school buildings and the second the university campus. The program is now ending its third year—the

first class will have arrived on the Seattle University campus in September 1977.

The first three years is a common program for all students, including a course that joins expository writing skills and religion, a course in mathematics, one in foreign language, one in fine arts, and one in science. Each is a three-year sequence, except that in the third year, the expository writing is linked with American civilization, and the religion course includes more church history (and is in a more traditional format). Each year there is also a course called the "Collegio" dealing with the humanities in general and including research work, visiting lecturers, class discussions, and so on. It is the key to integrating the program and, once again, seems not to be achieving its goals. It is the program's "necessary failure."

Form II is designed on a base of 135 quarter hours. Of these, 45 will be in interdisciplinary courses, probably problem-centered, and will form the core of the degree requirement, 45 will be in a single discipline (or for those who choose, in general studies); and 45 in electives. Of those 45, 30 will be from a restricted list, forcing breadth, 10 will be free, and 5 will be for the senior thesis, for which each student will have two advisers, one of whom will be from the student's major.

Strengths and Weaknesses

A visit in the late fall of the program's third year revealed both strengths and weaknesses, all readily apparent to those in charge. The split between the two forms was very real. The hoped for participation by Seattle University faculty in Form I courses had not occurred, use of the university library and facilities by the students remained minimal. Genuine discussion of a substantive nature between the two faculties was still missing. One or two of the proposed Form II courses were being tried out on advanced freshmen at Seattle University to provide a comparison base for the following year, but very little specific course planning had taken place.

It was fairly obvious that a formula different from the 3-3 organization was necessary, and there is now a move to establish a 2-2-2 formula that will force students onto the university campus and university faculty onto the Seattle Prep campus during the middle sequence. The interchange will also bring Matteo Ricci students back occasionally to the school campus in their fourth year so that the Form I students will see themselves as part of a total sequence. Otherwise there is a genuine danger of heavy attrition at the end of

the third year, when the high school diploma will be awarded.

There is a disparity between observed classroom behavior (which was definitely that of a high school in the classes I visited) and the mature level of awareness of the students I talked to in a large and not preselected group. They knew what they were about, what the program they were involved in was trying to do, and how their lives and their studies intermeshed. At 15 and 16 they were as verbal, open, and mature as any of the student groups I talked with at various early admission and early college programs.

The problems revealed in this dichotomy are largely pedagogical. Some of the faculty are very good and would be at ease on any college campus. Some are very much still high school teachers, concerned with basic disciplinary matters, quiz assignments, and lesson plans. Awareness of the problems exists. There is a complication here that does not have an easy solution, however. There is a stated conviction that no SU faculty will become strictly Matteo Ricci College (MRC) faculty, while all the faculty on the Seattle Prep campus will be totally Matteo Ricci faculty after the last Prep School class graduates. If all identifiable MRC faculty are secondary school teachers, it will be difficult to keep students, parents, and faculty from thinking of the college as a three-year preparatory program. In that case, the program will seem to jump students two years between institutions, and few students do that without slipping back a year.

Difficulties associated with dormitory housing are still in the future at SU. Form I is nonresidential, but a significant number of students are expected to choose to live at the university where social regulations are minimal and where there is no provision for separate housing. Matteo Ricci students will probably be housed together and a lounge area near their rooms will likely serve as their social center. Probably one of the Jesuit fathers will serve as head resident and also act as a friendly adviser and counselor.

The Matteo Ricci model is worth watching because it is the only one except Simon's Rock that provides a real possibility of cutting two full years off the sequence of 16 years after kindergarten. Its success will depend on its ability to develop and maintain a genuine sense of continuity and unity in the six-year sequence.

Early College Planning

The early college model clearly has several possibilities. If it is joined to a larger university, it faces both the problems encountered

in the Allen Center experience, and the necessity of linking its program with the educational goals of the university. It is forced to adopt the social regulations of the university and to try to find methods of working within those regulations. If it is designed as a separate unit, it faces the problems of any new institution in recruiting and financing and is forced to start from the beginning with boards of higher education (and boards of education in order to award the high school diploma somewhere along the way) and accrediting associations.

An early college must provide access to a college library, at least by the time it is in its third year. It must have a faculty whose members fulfill the usual requirements in degrees and experience for college teachers and also have the desire and necessary skills to work successfully with young students. It must have a social milieu in which the students are treated as young adults but also provides for the problems of adolescence, including appropriate restraints to help young people through difficult periods. It must have an evaluation program that provides outside examiners with tangible evidence that the students entering the college are capable of college work and that they have completed satisfactorily a full college program by the time they have finished. It must provide genuine opportunities for the young students to participate in the governance of the institution even though in the process a loss of efficiency in committee structure results at a time when both faculty and administrators are pushed to the limit to reach the goals of the new institution. Although various curricular patterns are possible, the main line of academic planning should be interdisciplinary, which means that the faculty must be very carefully chosen to make sure they are not really hard-line disciplinarians looking for a job. This is one of the most critical problems facing innovative programs everywhere in the United States today, and no one has yet found the modern "shibboleth" to identify the real from the sham interdisciplinarians. One of the advantages of beginning a totally separate early college is the ability to design a calendar that is different from the traditional two semester type in order to build in both independent study projects and off campus or intern projects.

Participation in Governance

Several elements common to all the early college plans deserve special attention. The first is student participation in governance. At both the Allen Center and Simon's Rock, student participation

at all levels and in all aspects of the program was seen as essential for the maturing effect, the support of student motivation, the sense of community, and the educational value. At Matteo Ricci there is also a remarkable amount of participation. In addition to the usual student council (that should never be considered a substitute for the kind of participation I am describing here), one student from each class of Form I sits on the academic council, a larger group sits on the advisory board, and there are usually student members on the disciplinary board. There is no question that participation of this kind, even though only a small number of students are involved, is one of the best ways for an institution to show students that they are being treated as young adults ready for college.

Entry Levels

One of the decisions the early college must make is at what levels students may enter the program. After an initial decision to limit entry to the first year, each institution quickly finds it has to be more liberal and allow later entry – after eleventh and twelfth grade. But there is growing evidence that the initial decision was educationally and institutionally sound. Analysis of trends across several programs indicates that when entries at the traditional level (post-twelfth grade) exceed one quarter, the attrition rates begin to climb sharply and the basic nature of the program and institution changes. The emphasis, therefore, should be on retaining the initial entry level while allowing some later entrants (and, of course, some younger entrants). Unlike the middle college, however, requirements for all degrees awarded should be kept within the college itself rather than depending on the academic level previously attained (except for full college credits, if any). Otherwise there will be problems in transferring credits and all the other elements of academic standardization. In any case, an early college is making a simple claim: it is a full college that allows students to begin earlier than other colleges usually do. Therefore, the grade the student enters from should have no bearing on the degree program at the college.

Degrees

An early college must offer at least one degree – the B.A. – to achieve its purpose, and one diploma – the high school diploma – to satisfy its young entrants and their parents. It may, as does Simon's Rock, offer the A.A. as a secondary leaving point. The critical decision is

how to award the diploma. Tying the diploma to specific numbers of credits is dangerous. The student's ability to transfer college credits from the program should always be guarded zealously. The best answer is to follow the lead of states like New York and award the diploma "upon completion of a year of college work." Naturally the situation will be different in each state. Where there is a state high school diploma, that is probably the kind to seek to award. Where there is a local option, an approach to the local board of education to grant high school equivalency is probably the best way. But the basic need is to gain the diploma granting authority before the first student enters the college if possible. Diploma accreditation can wait because all coursework will be at the college level.

Off Campus Experience

The Four School Study has a long and closely-reasoned section on the importance of getting this group of students out into the real world in work situations or internships. The Allen Center took that position seriously and worked out a highly successful program, both because of its location and because of its concentration in the behavioral and social sciences. The Extended Campus Program at Simon's Rock also shows how beneficial such experience is. An early college should provide the opportunity for this kind of program and also consider making it a requirement. Size, location, and academic applicability should all be considered carefully, but central to its success is the support of the faculty. If that support is missing, it is better to spend one's energies on something else and permit an individual student and a faculty member to create an independent study project to cover an off campus experience when the occasion arises.

Creative Arts

One final category of experience needs to be stressed in any early college situation: the creative arts. It is almost a certainty that any group of students who are different enough to try to begin college one or two years early in a special institution designed for their peer group will share some desire to take courses in the creative arts. The fact that a very high proportion of such students will be headed for medicine, science, and engineering should not be misleading. Music is almost always one of the special interests among science and engineering students. Therefore, an early college should have a strong arts program, and a very special arts faculty.

Students will frequently be without background or talent, and will want to try something new. Most students will want to study photography, ceramics, sculpture (often metal work and welding), and crafts such as jewelry and weaving instead of the usual introductory courses in drawing, design, and so on.

At the same time there will be a number of students who have chosen the early college in order to begin serious work in the arts. So the arts faculty will find itself trapped halfway between being a service program and a professional school, both in the context of an undergraduate liberal arts college. It is not an easy position in which to find oneself as an artist.

The faculty selected must be quite special and must be dedicated to the goals of the college, or they will be unhappy and spread that unhappiness. When they are the right people, they can add an element of creativity that can serve to bring the college together as a community. And their quest for ways to reconcile their various roles can become a useful model for others to follow.

Degrees and Accreditation

Having just finished an accreditation report as chairman of a visiting team for one of the regional accrediting associations as I write this, I am particularly aware of the astonishing lack of knowledge, even by academic administrators and faculty members, of the entire degree-granting authority and accreditation process. Trustees tend to know even less. And parents in general haven't a clue as to what it all means, but they do realize that in some mysterious way their children's academic fortunes and their own financial investment are at the mercy of the system, and they usually opt for the safe investment. An occasional institution or confluence of events can render accreditation less important than it usually is, but an institution that wants to recruit good students and to survive had better understand how the process works and how to operate within it as productively as possible.

To begin with, degree-granting authority has nothing to do with accreditation. That simple fact is not understood by millions of American students and their parents. Almost any visiting team member has had at least one student approach him with the question of what happens if the college loses its accreditation—"Will I be able to get a degree?"—while a group of other students hovers within hearing range to catch the crucial answer.

Degree-granting authority is a function of state government, usually emanating from a board of higher education. It may be secured in some states by paying a fee of as little as $25 while in others it requires long hours of consultation, official visits, public hearings, and all the other practices associated with a bureaucracy.

The Meaning of Accreditation

Since there is no unified standard for awarding a college degree, colleges themselves have joined together in six regional accrediting associations to seek to enforce standards of excellence on institutions that want to become members of the association. "Accreditation" actually means that an institution has become a member of the association after having been recommended for membership by a visiting team made up of faculty and administrators from other accredited institutions and then voted into membership by a commission on higher education of the association (actually the commission recommends membership and the whole association votes at an annual meeting). The commission is also made up of faculty and administrators from other accredited institutions who have been elected to their positions. The real decision about ac-

creditation is not made by the visiting team, but by the commission, which is free to accept, reject, or alter the recommendation. The more innovative or unusual the institution, the more likely is the commission to make a decision different from that of the team.

Although the general procedures of the six regional accrediting associations are similar, there is considerable difference in what is considered "accreditable." An institution that would make it easily into one association might not succeed in another. The attitude toward innovative colleges also varies considerably. Unfortunately, it also varies from year to year within an association, depending on the makeup of the commission. Visiting teams within an association also vary widely, and colleges are sometimes either very lucky or very unlucky in the makeup of a team.

All decisions are supposedly based on the specific question of whether an institution is actually performing as it says it is. This is why a self-study on the part of the college is an integral part of the process. There are some guidelines, but even these are interpreted in widely varying ways. There should be a liberal arts core for all students, the library should be able to support the program and should be spending about 5 percent of the college's operating budget (there are those who would claim that this percentage is not a guideline, but I don't believe it), the faculty should have appropriate training and degrees in the fields in which they teach, the faculty should determine the curriculum, there should be support services for the students, the trustees should have a working knowledge of the college, and there should be sufficient financial resources to assure the institution's continuing existence. But these are very general statements. The real basis for judgment is what the college says about itself.

Fortunately or unfortunately, there is more to the story than that. A commission that wants to can always find reasons to delay accreditation. It is much more difficult to take accreditation away. Thus, initial accreditation is always the most difficult step to achieve, especially at a time of closing colleges. Since accreditation is for an entire institution rather than for a part, it is better to go all the way to the highest degree sought rather than to grow in stages, if it is at all possible to do so. For example, high school diploma accreditation may not only make getting A.A. accreditation more difficult, but two different commissions are involved.

The professional staffs of both the state boards and the accrediting associations are the real strengths of both organizations, and

luckily they are often made up of very intelligent, informed, and understanding people. Although I can hear the sarcastic laughter of college presidents echoing in the lamplight, as they think of hours spent on phones or in staff offices when they read this, I stand by that claim.

Working with State Boards

One should begin working with a state staff in higher education with the assumption that there is not enough manpower to handle all the activities assigned to that office. There may be a state where this is not true, but I don't know of it. Next, one should try to make the initial contact with the highest officer of the staff—the chancellor or the commissioner. If seeking degree-granting authority, one is either planning a new college, seeking to move a secondary school into higher education, or changing a junior college to a B.A. institution. Any one of those three actions should be under the scrutiny of the top person. Naturally, one should try to secure an introduction through a third party if possible.

This course of action is just as important in a state that sells degree-granting authority over the counter as it is in the most complex and rigid systems. The goal is to establish the seriousness of intent, the pursuit of standards, and the honesty of approach that the new program will seek to represent. In return, a clear set of guidelines should be provided that, if followed, would practically guarantee the degree authority and the support and understanding of the central office.

Before the end of the first meeting, a specific person should be designated for the college to communicate with at the board office. And from that moment on, there should be a steady flow of paper to that person. I do not mean manufactured items; I mean planning documents, reports, and all evaluative material should be organized and submitted regularly to the state office. The routine annual report is not nearly enough.

There is a general rule to remember: even the most interested staff member can easily forget about any individual institution, no matter how much information has been submitted. Therefore, at least twice a year, and in the early stages more frequently than that, the president of the new college should visit the state office and bring the contact person up to date. Lunch is better than an hour appointment in the office, for the subject of these discussions is the nature of education itself, of new ways of articulating tradi-

tional structures. The staff person is of necessity spending most of his or her time with traditional structures and approaches. This can be as exciting an educational process for him as for the students at the institution.

The college should be willing to fulfill all the tasks set by the board office, but it should not be content to follow the timetable that may be suggested. For many reasons the staff may wish to slow the process down, play every move safely and carefully. Its position between the board on the one hand and the college on the other means that it will be subject to negative pressures from more traditional institutions. The college must press for a schedule that it considers necessary but realistic. Students and parents will want security about the degree-granting authority of the institution. If slowing-down techniques are introduced, they should be met with more information, more proof, and more pressure.

The best kind of proof is that from outside the institution. After all, everyone will recognize the fact that the institution itself will have a biased view. One answer is to try to have the staff itself visit or send visiting teams. Another is to set up a program of external examiners who will write up reports on their findings. There is no substitute for external evaluation.

At some point, in many states, there will be the critical moment of board decision. If everything proceeds positively, all is fine. If, however, a decision is made that is either negative or delaying, the institution, if it is sufficiently sure of itself, should appeal. At this point, not only should a long and detailed document that answers all objections be prepared, but additional evaluative information should be included, and a team consisting of administrators and faculty should present the college's case to the appeal board or committee. Neither the report nor the team should attack the decision of the board. It should present a positive statement – at the most presenting information the college may believe has been overlooked or that has been newly gathered. The college should try always to act in cooperation with the board and the staff. If the college is on defensible ground, the odds are strongly in its favor.

Accreditation

The same general rules hold for working with the regional accrediting association. A good rule of thumb is to work with the association parallel with the state offices. If it is possible to have joint meetings of staff personnel, so much the better. That certainly includes hav-

ing a state representative as an adjunct member of the visiting team at the time of the accreditation visit.

Contact with the chief executive officer of the regional commission on higher education should be made in the early stages of planning. The college program will want to achieve "Candidate for Accreditation" status as quickly as possible, and that will call for a planning document and an assessment visit. But more important, the college, its purposes, its goals, its rationale, should all be made familiar to the commission staff. These people are abreast of what is going on in education, are supportive of the purposes of the accreditation process, and are a mine of ideas, a source for names of educators with expertise in various fields, and are the final selectors of the various visitors who will be sent to the college. With their help, accreditation can be one of the most positive maturing processes the college goes through. Without their help—or with their antagonism—the college has two strikes against it from the start.

Most of the associations have alternate ways of approaching the accreditation process. An institution would do well to follow the standard approach unless there is very good evidence that a particular commission will look favorably on the alternate route. The staff will usually be attentive to and supportive of alternate ways, but unfortunately they are not the ones who make the final decisions. The college should try to find out as much as it can about the makeup of a commission before it adopts an unconventional approach.

If the new college program is well thought out, there should not be any great problem with candidate status. From that initial action until the time for accreditation approaches, the important actions are to file complete yearly reports (attaching much of the information sent on to the state offices) and to keep in touch with the commission staff.

One crucial decision that has to be made is when to ask for the accreditation visit. Usually, accreditation follows a year or two after the first degrees are awarded. This allows for information on the functioning of the entire program and for some followup on the graduates to illustrate the "outcomes" of the program: how successful were students in applications to graduate schools, securing employment in their chosen careers, and so on? Some institutions may be under pressure from parents, potential students, or graduate schools for accreditation before the first degrees are awarded. There is a clause in the rules of most regional associations stating

that accreditation may be granted when a substantial portion of the program has been completed. A college must decide whether to seek the earlier accreditation under very difficult conditions or wait the extra year.

A close relationship with the commission staff will be especially useful because, although it is not appropriate for the college to ask for or to accept advice, information can be secured that will help the college itself to make the correct decision. It is, of course, very helpful if the college can know the general attitude of the commission's members.

A good rule of thumb is that unless the college can prove that the entire program is working (another reason for some kind of external examiner system) and that graduates are being accepted by graduate schools, it is probably a good idea to wait for the usual period of time. Under no circumstances should the college ask for a visiting team until the spring of the first graduating year.

Visiting teams are chosen by the commission staff in consultation with the president of the college. Once again, close contact with the staff through the years will have been of great help. It is important for any innovative institution to have visitors who are open to new ideas. A traditionalist team chairman could be the death knell of an accreditation visit. A team of discipline-oriented faculty will not give the same understanding judgment to an interdisciplinary program as will a team of faculty members who have themselves worked in interdisciplinary programs. While visiting team members are cautioned not to use their institutions as a basis for comparisons, it is inevitable that they will do so at critical moments. In general, association staff members will try not to choose faculty from institutions that are undergoing accreditation visits themselves, but it is sometimes difficult to find a sufficient number of qualified visitors. A college president would be well advised to make certain the situation does not arise.

The naming of a chairman and others on the team should be done as early as possible. A little encouragement by the college is not out of place. After all, the choice is made cooperatively, and the staff has many colleges to consider. The team should be named at least six months before the visit if at all possible; if not, at least the chairman should be chosen by that time.

Not all associations require that the chairman visit the college before the team visit, but I think the college should ask for this. An innovative situation will provide enough different elements for it

to be beneficial for the chairman to be able to describe them to the team from personal observation before the team begins its own on-site investigation. Perhaps even more important, the chairman can advise the college of kinds of information that might be missing in the self-study and that would be particularly helpful.

The clue to all these suggestions is that the college should look upon the whole process as one of cooperation rather than of conflict. It should want to show the team just how well the new methods are functioning. Of course the college should be completely open and honest with the visiting team and should provide every conceivable piece of information that might be useful. It should also make sure that the living arrangements for the team are as comfortable as possible.

In its final meeting with the president of the college, the visiting team should give a full and accurate picture of what its report will contain (although the team does not reveal its recommendations, a sensitive person should be able to gather what they will be). The president also has the opportunity to correct the report for any factual errors before it goes to the commission, and to reply to the report if he thinks it insufficient or misleading.

If the decision is negative or if accreditation is postponed, the college can appeal. I recommend that it do so if it really thinks a mistake has been made. Such an appeal means another long report, another meeting of the kind already described with the state board. Once again, the college's position should be one of cooperation. Most commissions will not have experience with appeals, and awkwardness may develop. But the types of institutions under consideration here are struggling for structural change in American education. Awkward situations are perhaps inevitable. Pressures on commissions of higher education from traditional institutions are great and therefore new types of institutions must exert their own pressures for acceptance. Commission members, though honest and sincere educators, may share the biases and limited views of their colleagues. They are perhaps open to new approaches, but they have to be convinced. It is to be hoped that new articulation methods will soon be common, and will not be considered so strange and different. Until that time, the new institutions must undertake the education of educators as well as of late adolescents.

Is It Worth It?

One question that must have occurred to the reader is whether or not it is all worth the effort. If a school is doing a good or tolerable job with its present curriculum, why not simply leave things alone and try to do a better job with the present system?

The answer is certainly "yes" to the major question—is it worth it? Other questions mask a much deeper problem—that of inertia and lethargy. Almost everyone admits that the present system is not working well, and thus the burden of proof should lie with defenders of the status quo.

Where Should College Begin?

Perhaps the most obvious reason for the need for a new set of structures is that there is no evidence to support the present break between high school and college at age 18. Dependable research studies show a remarkably coherent developmental stage between the ages of 16 and 20, and there is no evidence that 18 is the most appropriate age for beginning a new educational stage. The breaking of the developmental stage in half should require of its supporters some very strong evidence for doing so.

The claim that "that is the way it's always been done," is simply not true. The real tradition is one of variety and flexibility. It is almost a matter of historical chance that the present structure has become so monolithic.

Today's voting age and the age when drinking is legal in many states does not support the K-12-4 structure, except by a kind of circular reasoning: both age determinations were based on the armed-service entry age, and this, in turn, was based on the age of high school completion, a result of the Committee of 10 recommendations, which had paid no attention to meaningful age developments. The only way to get out of the circle is to move to another structure.

It would be wrong to pretend that the answer is easy. To begin with, there are two components to consider: the academic and the social. To pretend that recent alterations in social codes on American campuses is unimportant is to suffer from extreme myopia. But the issues are again complex. We will soon have a student group whose parents brought about the sexual revolution and drug culture of the late 50s and early 60s. They may be more tolerant than their parents of social freedoms, or they may become more reactionary because of their own experiences. Probably they will be a little of both. At the same time we now have better instruments for discovering what the basic social problems of late adolescence are and

should take them into account when making educational plans. Most adults make statements about the maturity of adolescents that have only the flimsiest evidence to support them. One person's "maturity" is another person's "immaturity." We need to use the measures we have, such as the Loevinger, Kohlberg, and Perry scales, to discover some firm evidence, and everyone working on new articulation methods should be encouraged to help in the testing process.

Adolescent Decision-Making

As adults, we need to be scrupulously honest in our statements. I would submit that almost all of us would have to say that at 16 we were making our decisions about our behavior. Our parents may have felt that they were doing so for us, but we knew that wasn't so. I am not suggesting anything about age-group decisions, I am simply saying that individually, by 16, we were making most moral decisions on your own. Young people still are, at 16. Moreover, they have been making crucial decisions about drugs and sex even earlier than we were.

Yet most discussions about maturity and decision-making I listen to in educational circles tend to take for granted that 16-year-olds need to be protected by adults from decision-making. The issue is meaningless – adults can't make decisions for 16-year-olds nor can they protect the adolescents from making them. But they can and should act as models for decision-making and provide support when it is needed.

Academic Ability

On the academic side, there is no evidence whatever of the need to hold back bright late adolescents from college work. There is every evidence that to allow the bright student to start college work by 16 or 17 is to insure higher-than-normal performance. Since there is no correlation between emotional maturity and academic ability at this age, several answers have to be provided, not a single answer. I personally believe very strongly in the early college, and it would be surprising if I did not, but I do not believe it is the answer for all students. There is a place for every one of the models described in the previous pages.

If it is myopic to pay no attention to the change in social life on college campuses, it is equally myopic to believe that there is consistency in the quality of high school preparation for college in the

United States, or any consistency in level of preparation and achievement by students admitted by colleges. Open admissions, minority quotas, athletic scholarships, alumni children policies, enrollment targets, all insure that students of widely differing abilities and backgrounds are accepted in each entering class.

There is no question that the way to college work should be open for any student who is ready to move ahead, and this places an obligation on individual schools and colleges, as well as on the system as a whole, to provide openings.

Of course, the choice not to move ahead faster should also be available, but the choice, either way, should be primarily the student's, not the parent's or the teacher's.

Quality Education

If I were not so concerned about quality in education, this book would have been much easier to write. I am, for example, convinced that the range of standards is so wide in American secondary and postsecondary education today that it could not be lowered by eliminating a year or two. If a student in twelfth grade has fourth grade skills, eight grades might as well be eliminated.

But in well thought out programs both schools and colleges can gain by new articulation methods. I know of no high school with college course programs that has not been upgraded by their inclusion. Every study about carefully structured early admission programs indicates that the college has had its standards of expectation raised. Under the circumstances there is every reason to extend the possibilities to more students in more institutions. In the process everyone gains educationally.

Institutional Obligations

But there are wrong reasons for beginning such programs: trying to keep a college open by attracting more students of any caliber without reexamining the curriculum; trying to maintain a high school's tax support base by retaining seniors in school without raising educational standards; trying to find a program that will get foundation support without examining whether the institution will really profit from that program; restructuring a state system to cut two years of tax support without paying attention to the needs of all the students. Any one of those reasons might trigger a good program, but unless other qualities are also present, an institution will eventually be doing real harm to itself, its students, and

the educational system. In the end it would be self-defeating, for it will fail, and the present structure will return in an even more restrictive form.

The necessary elements should be clear by now. There must be good teaching and advising faculty members who enjoy working with this age group and are able to communicate ideas and subject matter. The best way to create the right blend is to encourage the interaction of secondary school and college teaching staffs as they have much to offer each other.

Proper support services for both academic and social activities and problems are necessary. Because not everyone will be involved in the new programs, many of those who are will need either some remedial or some counseling help on academic matters. Independent work must be aided and guided in the early stages. Students who are very advanced in some areas may need basic help in others. Social problems are bound to occur, and competent counseling services, orientation sessions, and all the rest are needed.

Social regulations will need to be geared to specific situations, but there seems to me to be one general guideline that is dismissed at peril: courage on the part of the institution; courage on the part of colleges to keep meaningful parietals for at least the first year while the adolescent adapts to the new world; courage on the part of schools to relax rules sufficiently to give the adolescent a sense of being trusted, of being ushered into the adult world.

The institutions must go out of their way to bring these young students into the governance structures of both academic and social organizations. If they are to handle themselves and their work maturely, they must be treated as mature individuals.

College Level Work

And at the heart of all the programs, if we are really concerned about quality education, the institutions involved must insure that the courses are of college level. That phrase has been used, and perhaps overused, in this study. Just what is involved in college level work? Again, I must insist that we are not discussing what gets by for college credit at many institutions, but what colleges have striven for throughout the centuries – the genuine tradition.

For one thing it means independence of thought, often carefully encouraged and nurtured. It means information integrated in larger bodies of thought, a process that is both rational and perceptual. It means the ability to deal with ideas with an intensity of

feeling that can only come through blending personal experience with reason. It means being able to differentiate between opinion and fact, between hypothesis and proof. It means being able to formulate questions and organize answers. And it means being able to communicate one's ideas to others with as little loss of meaning in the transference as possible.

Simply copying a college syllabus will not guarantee a college course, nor will repeating facts indicate that a real college experience has been achieved. The purpose of new articulation methods should be to free the student for a better education than is now possible.

Flexibility

The current system is hurting thousands, perhaps millions of students. For many, it is a stultifying experience; for others, a boring waste of time; for some it is a cause for dropping out. The answer is in greater flexibility. In the process we need to learn more about the age group. For if many are hurt now, we want to make sure that whatever answers we provide do not hurt them or others equally as much. We must be aware of students both as individuals with different learning rates and as whole persons with complex maturational systems. The educational community should not try to make those individuals conform to some "ideal" model of a human being but should provide a flexible system that permits students to move ahead at speeds most appropriate for them. It would be a mistake to try to force them ahead before they are ready, but we should make sure that we don't hold them back.

Current Methods for Shortening the Time to the Bachelor's Degree

Within a College:
- All-college programs
  - Three-year degree programs
  - Year-round scheduling
  - Undergraduate-graduate shortened programs (for example, six-year medical programs)
- Individual options
  - Course credit by examination
    (Most college catalogs mention this option, but it is seldom exercised or encouraged.)
  - Course overload and/or summer school
  - Advanced Placement and College-Level Examination Program examinations for advanced placement in colleges

High School-College Overlap:
- Advanced Placement courses and examinations for advanced standing or placement
- International Baccalaureate – usage similar to AP, sometimes linked with early admission to junior colleges
- Early admission
- College courses offered to commuting students in area; partial or full-time program; one or two semesters
- Courses offered in high schools for college transcript credit
  - Joint high school–college credit
  - High school faculty acting in adjunct status
  - College faculty teaching in the high schools
- Summer school courses open to high school students on college campuses
- Correspondence courses

Special Programs:
- Early GED tests for high school diploma
- State diploma tests
- Early graduation (shortened school program)
- "Freshman College" for younger-than-normal students
- Middle College – grades 11 to 14
- Early College – four years from tenth or eleventh grade or six years from eighth grade